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FORTUNA*

The treatise commonly known as Περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου, *De natura hominis*, was very widely read and quoted almost from its own day until the seventeenth century and even later. A remarkable feature of the fortuna of this work is that in spite of its dissemination in whole or in part in both Eastern and Western scholarly circles, more individuals probably read the text under the name of Gregorius Nyssenus or as anonymous rather than as the product of its real author, Nemesius of Emesa. His exact identity has long been a matter for speculation among scholars. That he was a scientist-physician as well as a cleric can hardly be questioned. Some scholars have advanced the suggestion that he was Nemesius, the friend of Gregorius Nazianzenus and governor of Cappadocia, who was raised as a pagan but who later embraced Christianity.¹ Many men were named Nemesius at the time, however, and it has not been possible to identify the author of *De natura hominis* definitely with any one of them.² It can be said with some certainty that he was a bishop of Emesa, modern Homs in Syria, possibly the fifth to occupy that see, and that by the year A.D. 400 at the latest, he had written his famous book.³

As the late Benedict Einarson pointed out, Περὶ φύσεως ἁνθρώπων was not the title of the entire work, which was unfinished, but of the first chapter, although it became generally used as the title for the whole.⁴ There were exceptions as is evidenced by the remark of Johannes Diaconus Veronensis (s. XIV) in an extant fragment of his *Historia Imperialis* in which he spoke of Burgundio’s Latin version of the entire treatise as “De anima . . . librum de anima valde obscurem qui a iudice Pisano translatus fuit in Latinum tempore Friderici II [sic] Imperatoris.”⁵

Uncertainty about the identity of the author is reflected in the common though erroneous attribution of the work to Gregory of Nyssa in one branch of the Greek tradition and hence in the Latin and Eastern-language versions dependent on it. The tremendous popularity of *De natura hominis* was not attributable to the reputation of a prominent writer, but to its content. That same popularity, however, led readers and copyists to

1. See Gregorius Nazianzenus, *Epistolae*, 198, 199, 200, 201 (PG XXXVI, 321 – 29), and *Carmen ad Nemesium* (Carmen II.2.7).
5. See J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Latina Mediae et Infimae Aetatis*, I (Florentiae, 1858), 282. In addition, it is possible that the title *De natura humana et de providentia* in a now lost manuscript (Torino, Biblioteca Nazionale J V 27; see Kristeller, *Iter*, II, 179) refers to a Latin version of *De natura hominis*; see TCT, V, 120.
seek for, or to assume, a well-known figure as the author. It cannot now be determined who first attributed Nemesis' treatise to Gregory of Nyssa, but a reader or hearer presented with the name of Nemesis Emesenus, which was unfamiliar to him, and knowing that Nyssenus, an illustrious figure of the same era, had written a work with approximately the same title, Περὶ κατασκευῆς ἀνθρώπου De orificio hominis, obviously would not find it hard to conclude that "Nemesis" was an error for Nyssenus, and that the latter name could be spelled "Emis(s)enus" or "Emsenus" or the like. More obscure or involved explanations probably should not be sought for the resultant confusion of authorship. So although the content of the two treatises was quite different, the similarity of the authors' names and of the titles of their works contributed heavily to the erroneous attribution of De natura hominis to Nyssenus, with few exceptions in the West, and even in the Greek and Near Eastern traditions, before the mid-sixteenth century. Hence Nemesis' work is found in printed editions of the Latin Nyssenus from 1512 through 1562, which certainly influenced the popularity of the work.

Several manuscripts contain another variant of the author's name, unrelated to the confusion with Nyssenus, and we find Adamantios or Adamantion used separately or together with Nemesis. F. Turrianus in his scholia to Johannes Cyprianiotes, Dec. v, ch. 9, quoted Nemesis Adamantius, liber II, de homine; the passage is from De natura hominis chapter II. Though the origin of the appellation is unknown, the case bears some analogy to that of Origenes Adamantius (see Hieronymus, De vir. illustr., ch. LIV.

6. See CTC, V, 5 and 16, for attribution to Nyssenus. For confusion in spelling see, e.g., Honorius of Autun (s. XII) in De luminaribus ecclesiae; and Trithemius (1462–1519) in De script. eccles. For the concern of an early sixteenth-century translator see below, p. 58.

7. A scholion in one manuscript of the Latin version of Alfanus gives the real author's name; the versions of Valla and Anonymus B (1541), which named Nemesis, were not well known.

8. See CTC, V, Gregorius Nyssenus, Composite Editions.


10. K. Burkhard, Wiener Studien, XI (1889), 150 (see Bibliography C, below); the Praefatio to Matthaei's edition, p. 33, in which Fabricius discusses the question; and especially M. Morani, La tradizione manoscritta del "De natura hominis" di Nemesis, (Milan, 1981), 11, 15.

The note on this passage in PL XXIII, 664, suggests one meaning; J. Quasten, Patrology [Utrecht, 1960], II, 38, and Liddell and Scott prefer another. See also Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. VI, 14; Pauly-Wissowa, I, 343, Adamantios 3).

Another unusual rendering of Nemesis' name occurs in attributions of quotations from De natura hominis to a "Remigius." This was first brought to light by Ignatius Brady in the course of his preparation of an edition (1948) of a newly discovered Liber de anima by William of Vaurillon (Vorillon), a Franciscan scholar who died in 1453. William quoted from a Remigius, Liber de anima; the quotations almost certainly came from Nemesis' work. The investigations revealed that the same work was quoted as Remigius' by a number of others in that era such as Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas, ps. Bonaventure, and John of Rupella. The earliest known use of Remigius for Nemesis is by Philip the Chancellor (d. 1236). One hypothesis attempting to explain the substitution of Remigius for Nemesis suggests that there existed one or more manuscripts whose prototype was the work of an unlearned copyist who, as described above, was unfamiliar with the obscure name Nemesis and changed it to the more familiar (to him) Remigius (of Auxerre, s. IX). This error might well have arisen in France. Benedict Einarson offered another suggestion based on a scribal hand in which "n" looked like "r" and "s" like "g." The problem awaits further study.

There are roughly one hundred Greek manuscripts extant today containing all or part of Nemesis' treatise. Recent studies by Moreno Morani have refined the older grouping of the manuscripts by Karl Burkhard. There are, broadly speaking, two main manuscript families. The first, β, includes the prototype of the


12. Information on the number of manuscripts was obtained from the late Benedict Einarson's Introduction to his critical edition of the Greek text and was kindly furnished by Phillip De Lacy, who is preparing the text for publication. See also Morani, La tradizione manoscritta, 220–24.

13. See Morani, La tradizione manoscritta, which is devoted to this subject. See also General Bibliography below, p. 45, under Manuscript Tradition. Burkhard's work appears in Wiener Studien, X (1888), 93–135; XI (1889), 143–52, 243–67.
now unknown exemplars used by Alfanus, Anonymus B, and Valla, as well as by the Georgian translator. In them Nemesius is named as author of *De natura hominis*. The prototype of the second family, *γ*, lies behind Vatican Library, Chis. R. IV.13 (s. X–XI), a manuscript very like if not the same as that used by Burgundio. John of Damascus’ text is related indirectly to this group. 14 Gregory of Nyssa is usually named as author in these copies, although some manuscripts seem to cross strictly drawn boundaries. 15

A discussion of chapter divisions is beyond the scope of this article. Einarson concluded from his research that the divisions were probably in the archetype but do not go back to the author himself. 16 The sequence of material is about the same for chapters I–XVIII, but at times two chapters are combined into one (e.g., chs. IV and V by Burgundio as also by his source resembling Vatican Library, Chis. R. IV.13 (s. X–XI) or a close relative. Ellebodius’ text and others based on it, those of Christian Friedrich Matthaei and J. P. Migne, followed John of Damascus in placing “De metu” (their ch. XX) before “De ira” (their ch. X XI). Their exemplar must have shown this order also; but Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. T.1.6 (Misc. 184), with whose text John’s excerpts have been demonstrated to have an affinity, gives the order “De ira,” “De metu.” 17 This succession also appears in Burgundio, Valla, and Cono. Alfanus’ translation has a confused order of the contents and in addition omits seven sections. There exist a number of other irregularities in the arrangement of materials. Among them is the transposition of chapter I to the end of the treatise in at least one instance (Venice, Biblioteca Marciana Nazionale gr. 266, s. XV). One eleventh-century manuscript, Oxford, Bodleian Library Auct. E. V. 4 (misc. 69), is described by H. O. Coxe, *Cat. Bodl.* I (1953), 655, as “liber in capita lviii distributus.”

Some Greek manuscripts contain only chapters II and III, *De anima*; among them are Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale II.4837 (s. XVI); Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek gr. 512 (s. XV) and 291 (s. XVI); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Holk. 107 (s. XVI); Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale 107 (120 Cosentini) s. XVI. They all attribute the text to Nyssenus. 18 Fabricius mentions in addition an Augsburg manuscript of this type.

The two manuscripts Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. E.1.6 (s. XIV) and Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, 4758 (s. XVI) also contain these two chapters and assign them to Nyssenus. Nicholas of Cusa and Erasmus both used the Oxford manuscript and it was Johannes Cono’s *only* Greek source for the text of Nemesius (See below p. 57.). But these two manuscripts also contain Nemesius, Chapters XXIV and XXV, *De pulsibus* and *De generandi facultate*, a fact which has not heretofore been emphasized; they are obviously unusual companions for the *De anima* chapters. Moreover, immediately following them is a series of pericopes drawn from the genuine Nyssenus, Irenejous, and Theodoretus which furnish a kind of commentary by parallel passages. The well documented histories of the Oxford and Madrid manuscripts seem to preclude any direct connection and require positing of a common ancestor for the Nemesius portions; the remaining contents of both manuscripts differ completely. 19

J. Draeseke’s hypothesis that Chapters II and III were already in s. VIII ascribed to Nyssenus as yet lacks verification but merits further study although generally rejected. The explanation for the separate circulation of Chapters II and III (though obviously not of all of the material in the Oxford and Madrid manuscripts) may be quite simple. The subject matter, *De anima*, was very popular. It could have appealed to the religious-philosophical community in a way that the medical-scientific chapters could not have. Separate copies of just the *De anima* chapters may well have been in demand, possibly for comparison with Aristotle’s famous work on the subject. Nemesius was not well known. An unlearned scribe might easily have thought that he saw “Nyssenus,” who was renowned for his spiritual writings, when in reality “Nemesius” was written. As late as 1638 the two chapters

were printed in an edition of Nyssenus' works. Indeed, J. P. Migne took that edition as the basis for his edition of Nyssenus in his *Patrologia Graeca*, and the Nemesis chapters were reprinted in its several editions, although scholars had long since recognized their real author (see below, p. 42).

Chapters II and III were not the only ones to circulate separately. Chapters I–III appear in several Greek manuscripts. Chapter I alone appears in the Greek *Florellium Coislinianum* (ca. A.D. 850). The well-known manuscript, Dresden Sächsische Landesbibliothek 58 (s. XV) contains only chapters XXXIV–XXXVII. Many other examples could be cited.

One other work has at times been attributed to Nemesis of Emesa, the *De contemnenda morte* (see below, p. 68). In the present era Draeseke alone has supported Nemesian authorship, but he has failed to convince the majority of scholars. The treatise is generally accepted as the work of Demetrius Cydones, a fourteenth-century monk.

1. Nemesis in the Greek and Byzantine World

Nemesis' name is first mentioned in Greek literature in s. VII, when both Maximus Confessor and Anastasius Sinaiticus quoted passages from *De natura hominis* and named Nemesis as its author. The anonymous compiler of the treatise *De anima ad Tatianum*, who some think may have been a Syrian and who lived at some time in the period between s. V and s. VII, used Nemesis extensively without naming him.

By the early eighth century something had happened to confuse the question of authorship of *De natura hominis*; no Greek witness is extant from this period (for the 716/717 Armenian version attributed to Nyssenus, see p. 39 below). There is no proof that John of Damascus (ca. 650–749) had any responsibility for the attribution of Nemesis' treatise to Nyssenus. He does incorporate in the *De fide orthodoxa* portion (742–749) of his monumental *Fons scientiae* large blocks of quotations from *De natura hominis*. John sometimes names his sources. He never mentions Nemesis; he sometimes mentioned Gregory of Nyssa when quoting him; on other occasions he did not. Later writers, noting his fondness for Nyssenus, suggested that John attributed his quotations from *De natura hominis* to him. Subsequent generations of scholars followed them. One must recall that John was also fond of Maximus Confessor, quoting him often; Maximus assigned *De natura hominis* to Nemesis. The importance of the Damascene in the *fortuna* of Nemesis lies both in the sheer volume of text quoted and in the immense popularity of the vehicle (*De fide orthodoxa*) that carried it, spreading knowledge of the portions quoted. John's chapters XXVI–XLIII (Book II.12–II.29) are made up largely of quotations from Nemesis loosely strung together by connecting sentences. John must have had a text in front of him because there are many verbatim quotations in addition to paraphrased passages. Whether he used a copy of *De natura hominis* or a florilegium has been debated. The hundreds of still extant manuscripts of *De fide orthodoxa* give evidence of the wide circulation of John's work containing the excerpts from Nemesis.

Since *De fide orthodoxa* was so important in both the Greek East and the Latin West in the *fortuna* of Nemesis, *De natura hominis*, there follows a much simplified list of the chapters of Nemesis from which John excerpted to a greater or lesser extent. It is intended only for the general reader. Those wishing to make a detailed study should consult the studies listed in the footnote.


21. See CTC, V, 63 ff.


The first column lists the main chapters of the *De fide orthodoxa*, in the translation of Burgundio, in which Johannes Damascenus makes use of the *De natura hominis;* the second column lists the corresponding chapters of the *De natura hominis*, also in the translation of Burgundio.

**Johannes Damascenus**

*De fide orthodoxa*

(tr. Burgundio)

Ch. XXVI (II.12) De homine
Ch. XXVII (II.13) De laetitias
Ch. XXVIII (II.14) De tristitia
Ch. XXIX (II.15) De timore
Ch. XXX (II.16) De ira
Ch. XXXI (II.17) De imaginativo
Ch. XXXII (II.18) De sensu

(includes topics
in Nemesius, VI–X)

Ch. XXXIII (II.19) De excogitativo
Ch. XXXIV (II.20) De memorativo
Ch. XXXV (II.21) De interius...sermone
Ch. XXXVI (II.22) De passione
Ch. XXXVIII (II.24) De voluntario et involuntario

Ch. XXXIX (II.25) De libero arbitrio
Ch. XL (II.26) De iis quae sunt

Ch. XLI (II.27) Propter quam causam liberi arbitrio facti

sumus...

Ch. XLIII (II.29) De providentia

In the ninth century, Meletius, a monk from Tiberiopolis in north Phrygia, made extensive use of Nemesius’ work in the course of compiling his *Synopsis*, a collection of opinions from writings of philosophers and fathers of the church on the nature of man. He quoted so many passages almost verbatim that his treatise came to have almost the value of another manuscript of Nemesius. Meletius did not name his

Nemesius

*De natura hominis*

(tr. Burgundio)

I De homine
XVII De volupatibus
XVIII De aegritudine
XX De timore
XIX De ira
V De imaginativo
VI De visu
IX De auditu
X De odoratu
VIII De gustu
VII De tactu
XI De excogitativo
XII De memorativo
XIII De logo endiatheto
XV Alia divisio
XXVIII De voluntario et involuntario
XXIX De involuntary
XXX De involuntary quod est propter ignorantiam
XXXI De voluntario
XXXII De electione
XXXVIII De libero arbitrio
XXXIX De eo quod sunt quaedam in nobis
XL Propter quam causam...

Ch. XLI De providentia

source for the quotations in the body of his work, but the anonymous author of the prooemium to the *Synopsis* lists authors whom he thought Meletius used. Nyssenus, not Nemesius, appears in the list.25

Leo Medicus, who may or may not be identical with Leo Philosophus, and who may have lived at the end of the ninth century, composed *Synopsis de natura hominum*, which was noth-

---

24. A good case for placing Meletius no earlier than s. XII has recently been made by Morani, *La tradizione manoscrita*, 132–50. This theory must be weighed against the undisputed fact of the use of Meletius by Leo Medicus/Philosophus, who may have lived in the late ninth century. On the uncertainty of date, see R. Renehan, cited in footnote 26, below.

ing more than a series of excerpts from Meletius, *Synopsis*. Since Leo was primarily interested in medical matters, however, he quoted only a few of the Nemesis excerpts in Meletius.26

Moreno Morani has called attention to the quotations from Nemesis which appear in the ps. John of Damascus, Barlaam and Joasaph tale27 and to the extensive use made of Nemesis by Nilus Doxapatrius (fl. ca. A.D. 1145)28 in his *De oeconomia Dei in homines*.

Michael Glykas (last two-thirds of s. XII) quoted Nemesis a number of times in his *Annales*. Sometimes he referred to him by name (e.g., PG, CLVIII, 141; 213); elsewhere he quoted a passage without mentioning the author (e.g., PG, CLVIII, 149). Awaiting further study are the questions raised by Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodl. 94 (s. XV), which contains the epitomes by Andrea Dono of Nemesis’ treatise and of Nicephoras Blemmydes (s. XIII), *Epitome physica*. For whatever reason the first portions of both epitomes are identical.

In assessing the influence of Nemesis on later writers, care must be taken to avoid naming Nemesis as the source in cases when the material that appears both in his and in later writers’ work was borrowed or adopted by Nemesis from earlier authors. This is especially true of the medical chapters and those that treat of the soul. For an illustration of such a situation, see H. Diels, *Doxographi Graeci* (Berlin, 1879), 386ff.

2. Near Eastern Translations

Knowledge of *De natura hominis* began to spread in Syriac- and Arabic-speaking circles at least by s. VI. Around that time an anonymous writer compiled a treatise *De anima ad Tatianum* in which he quoted Nemesis. The work was later generally ascribed to Gregorius Thaumaturgus, but at times Nyssenus or Maximus Confessor was named as author. The treatise was obviously put together in several stages. A Syriac manuscript in the British Library (Add. 14658, Wright, *Cat. of Syriac Mss in the B.M.*, III, 1157) contains this work ascribed to Aristotle. The Syriac version of all works in the manuscript is attributed to the well-known Sergius of Reschina (s. VI), who was probably unaware that he was translating passages from Nemesis, not Aristotle. See CTC, V, 63ff. on the treatise itself and, on the Syriac manuscript, see B. Einarson, “On a Supposed Pseudo-Aristotelian Treatise on the Soul,” *Classical Philology*, XXVII (1933), 129–30.

By the middle of the eighth century, during the flowering of learning under Harun al Raschid (ca. 764–809), the Catholikos Timotheos I was also promoting Syriac translations of Greek works. In his Letter 43 addressed to Rabban Mar Petion, he asked him to look up a number of Greek writings. Then he said, “Seek also for the proposition of a certain philosopher who is named Nemesis, which is about the ordinance of man, and its beginning is this: man is very beautifully fashioned from a spiritual soul and a body. And he completed this in five sections, more or less, and promised to take up concerning the soul. But this second one does not exist.” Timotheos perhaps had in front of him a catalogue listing Nemesis’ treatise among others and giving an incipit and explicit. He asked Petion for a copy of the first work and said the second, promised one did not (as far as he knew) exist.29

Though nothing positive can be drawn from Timotheos’ letter about Syriac translations of Nemesis, we do have proof that they existed. A scholiast on an Armenian version must have had a Syriac translation in front of him when he stated, “Here the Syriac version translates *zotikon*” (rather than *pathetikon*). Some scholars believe that Syriac versions bore the name of Nyssenus.30 On the other hand, we know that the ninth-century bishop of Mosul, Moses bar

27. No author for the quotations is named. The Greek version dates from s. XI and is probably the work of Euthymius the Georgian. For details see Morani, *La tradizione manoscritta*, 120.
29. Text in O. Braun, “Briefe des Katholikos Timotheos I,” *Oriens Christianus*, II (1911), 1–29, esp. 8–11; J. Draeseke, “Ein Testimonium Ignatianum,” *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, XLVI (1903), 505–12; Telfer, *Cyril of Jerusalem*, 216–17. I am indebted to R. A. Henshaw, Professor of Old Testament, Colgate Rochester Divinity School, for his translation and analysis of Timotheos’ statement on Nemesis’ work. He states that the Syriac cannot bear the meaning that Timotheos lacks only a copy of the second work; Timotheos has neither work.
Kepha (ca. 815–903), paraphrased some passages of chapter II of Nemesius’ treatise in his *De anima* without naming his source. In his *De paradiso* he said, “Hanc sententiam firmat Numysius philosophus Christianus sic scribit.” The passage that follows has never been located in *De natura hominis*. Likewise the Syrian Job of Edessa (d. 835) incorporated passages from Nemesius, without naming him, in his *Ketaba de Simata* (Book of Treasures).

Our knowledge of the influence of Nemesius in Arabic-speaking circles has recently increased measurably and continues to expand. Four different versions are now established as a result of the investigations of Khalil Samir. They can be dated from ca. 815 to ca. 911 and are mentioned here in the order in which they came to the attention of scholars. For many years only one Arabic version of *De natura hominis* was known. It was attributed, at least by the time of Abu al Barakat (s. XIV), to the great Nestorian scholar, physician, and translator, Hunain ibn Ishāq (d. 873) (see Bibliography under Graf and Sarton). Some manuscripts and a number of later scholars assigned the version to his son, Ishāq ibn Hunain (d. 910/911) (Morani, Van Riet, Verbeke). More recently Samir, basing his conclusions on more manuscripts, chronological considerations, and a careful analysis of the language and style, pointed out that there were two distinct recensions of this version; he believes that Hunain himself was responsible for the first because it must date from before 873 (see his argument). His son may have been the reviser of his father’s translation. Both recensions name Nysseus as author of *De natura hominis*.

In 1942 Paul Kraus called attention to another, earlier Arabic version, which appeared in connection with a treatise that formed part of the Jabir Corpus. This collection was compiled later but went under the name of Abu Musa Jābir ibn Hayyān (721–813), who was a celebrated chemist. He, or the later compiler, acknowledged his use of the work of one Balinas, which was entitled either *Kitab sīr al-halīqa* (Liber secreti creationis) or *Kitab al-ʾīlā* (Liber de causis). Balinas quoted Nemesius’ work. Scholars have long identified Balinas with a ps. Apollonius (s. V–VII), as distinguished from the real Apollonius of Tyana, who lived around 100. Some believe a Greek original underlay this *De causis*; others argue for an intermediate Syriac version, possibly the work of Sergius of Reschaina (d. 535). In any case, Nemesius was not only quoted by Balinas; in some manuscripts of Recension B of the work, *De causis*, there is appended to the text as an extended footnote on a quotation an abridged version of the first thirty chapters of *De natura hominis*. All allusions to Christian doctrine are removed for Islamic readers. Moreover, the language is more archaic than that of the text on which it is a comment.

Samir’s recent detailed study offers proof for the earlier conclusion of Kraus and Weissner that this version dates from ca. 815 during the caliphate of Maʾmun (813–833). It is the earliest known Arabic version of Nemesius’ work. A Latin translation of Balinas, *De causis*, but not of the appended Nemesius text, was made in the twelfth century by Hugo Sanctelliensis.

A fourth, partial Arabic translation, of chapter I only, appears in the manuscript Sinai, arab. 481. Attention has been called to it by Samir, who considers it the most accurate of the four with respect to the Greek text. He dates it ca. 850. It alone of the four versions names Nemesius as the author.

A study of the quotations from Nemesius found in works of Abdallāh ibn al-Faḍl (s. XI

31. See G. Klinge, “Die Bedeutung der syrischen Theologen . . .”, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*. Folge 3, no. 9 (1939), 362ff. For the passage in *De paradiso*, ch. XX, see PG, CXI, 508. For *De anima* see Morani, *La tradizione manoscritta*, 100. See also Paul Kraus (Bibliography E, below), p. 78 and note on text, p. 340.

32. There is an English translation edited by A. Mingana (1935).

33. I am indebted to the late Benedict Einarson for bringing to my attention the use of Nemesius in the Jabir corpus, and to Gerard Verbeke for his assistance in locating a copy of U. Weissner’s work.

34. Moreno Morani apprised me of the research of Khalil Samir, who subsequently generously provided a copy of his as yet unpublished conclusions regarding the Arabic versions of *De natura hominis*.

35. See especially the study of Khalil Samir, and, in addition, Paul Kraus (see Bibliography E, below), 280; the critical edition of U. Weissner and her comment, pp. 23ff.

36. Paris lat. 13951 (fols. 1–31) (s. XII in.). Hugo probably came from northwestern Spain, which may have been the cause of P. Nau’s belief that a Hebrew version underlay the translation. See C. Haskins, *Studies in the History of Medieval Science* (Cambridge, 1927), 79–80. There is also an anonymous version in Vienna, ÖNB, 3124, s. XV. A critical edition is in preparation by D’Alverny and Hudry in Paris.

37. Khalil Samir is preparing a critical edition of this version.
3. NEMESIUS IN THE LATIN WEST

There is no firm evidence for direct acquaintance with the *De natura hominis* in the West in the early Middle Ages. Julianus Pomerius (ca. 450–98) composed a now lost work, *Libri octo de anima*, and the summary of its contents by Gennadius of Marseilles (d. s. V ex.) in his *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis* (ch. 98, PL, LVIII, 1117–18) indicates that the resemblance to Nemesius, *Libri octo de philosophia*—to use the title given *De natura hominis* by Johannes Cono in the sixteenth century—was probably confined to the titles of the books. Those of the first two (1. Quid sit anima vel qualiter ad imaginem Dei credatur facta, and 2. Utrum anima corporea (incorpora debeat credi) obviously dealt with some of the same topics as did Nemesius in his chapters II and III. One cannot, however, say, as did William Cave (1637–1713) followed by Gallandi (1709–79), that Pomerius was directly indebted to Nemesius. “De anima” was a favorite topic with many writers across the centuries, and dependence of the opinions of one author upon those of another “De anima” is difficult to prove.

A portion of chapter V of Nemesius’ work (PG, XL, 626C–631A; Matthaei [Lat.], 45, 4–46, 28) is inserted into the sixth-century Latin translation by Dionysius Exiguus of Gregory of Nyssenus, *De opificio hominis*, in the edition of 1537 and in some later editions. This insertion (in the revision of J. Cono of Burgundio’s version of Nemesius) is the work of the sixteenth-century editor, not of Dionysius. See CTC, V, 121.

An incomplete translation of the *De natura hominis*, lacking seven chapters, appeared in the eleventh century. It was the work of Alfanus, bishop of Salerno. He gave no indication of the author’s name; he even entitled the work *Prennon Physicon* (on the title see below, p. 47). Either the manuscript he used did not name the author, or he himself had doubts about the one indicated. Moreover, only one manuscript of this version bore Alfanus’ name, and that in the margin. Hence it is not surprising that little attention has been paid to the widespread knowledge of his translation. In the middle of the next century John of Salisbury (1115–80) had obviously read at least part of it. In his *Metalogicon*, Bk. IV, ch. XX (ed. C. C. J. Webb, 928b, p. 187), he stated, “Nam et doctores Ecclesiae et post eos Claudianus (Mamertus) et aliis moderniores de anima multa scripsurunt, quos si quis non potest evolvere, vel *Prenonphisicon* legat, librum de anima copiosissime disputantem. Eum tamen aliis omnibus non prepono. Sed haec haec tamen.” Webb believed *Prenonphisicon* referred to William of

---

38. At present see Morani, *La tradizione manoscritta*, 95–96.
39. Morani has refined the previously accepted date, *ibid.*, 71.
40. Numerous manuscripts in Eastern libraries are listed *ibid.*, 72ff.

---

med.) and Mu’taman al-Dawlah ibn al-Assâl (s. XIII med.) is being carried on by Khalil Samir. 38

Around 980 Ibn an-Nadim, compiler of the encyclopedia *Fihrist*, referred to *De natura hominis* as the work of Nyssenus.

The first Armenian translation appeared in 717. 39 It named Nyssenus as author. This version omitted a number of passages but is still a valuable witness to a form of the text somewhat different from that commonly known. Only the manuscripts in Western libraries have thus far been studied. 40 The four codices of the Biblioteca dei Pardi Mechitaristi, Isola di San Lazzaro at Venice belong to family β; the codex in Vienna follows tradition γ. The translation claims to have been made at Constantinople by David Hypatos, the cellarer, and Stephanos, a priest, grammarian, and pupil of Moses, bishop of Siunia. This Armenian version was published by the Mechitarists of Venice in 1889. The notes of Moreno Morani anticipating a new critical edition have already been published. There also exists an unpublished Armenian commentary from the late eleventh or early twelfth century. Morani suggests that it might be called an epitome. 41

*De natura hominis* was translated into Georgian by Johannes Petric’i around 1000. It was edited by S. R. Gorgadse at Tbilisi in 1924. Unfortunately, he had no Greek text at hand and worked from the Georgian with only the help of Theodor Vladimirskij’s Russian translation from the Greek. Georgian manuscripts belong to family β and attribute the treatise to Nemesius. A new edition of the works of Petric’i including his Nemesius has been in preparation at Tbilisi, according to the late Benedict Einarson.
St. Thierry’s *Physica animae*. This was the title of chapter II, which quoted liberally from Eriugena’s version of Gregory of Nyssa’s *De opificio hominis*; William’s treatise as a whole bore the title *De natura corporis et animae*. Moreover, in the late twelfth century the monks of St. Edmundsbury had in their possession a manuscript, possibly copied by one of their community, containing *Premonn Physikon*, though it did not mention Alfanus’ name. It also contained an anonymous translation of a chapter of Nemesius, *De elementis*. Interest in scientific subjects had been cultivated in England by thinkers such as Adelard of Bath, who visited Salerno before 1109, not long after Alfanus’ death. John of Salisbury’s own travels in Italy may have brought him into contact with circles in which Alfanus was known.

One should keep in mind that in the Latin West, as in the Greek East (see above, p. 35), the *De fide orthodoxa* of John of Damascus was an important vehicle for the indirect transmission of large segments of *De natura hominis*, though not under the name of Nemesius.\(^{42}\) There are four known Latin versions of *De fide orthodoxa* before 1500: by Cerbanus (ca. 1145) though only chapters XLV–LII (i.e., III.1–III.8); by Burgundio of Pisa (1153–54); by Grosseteste, a revision of Burgundio (1235–40); and by Baptistus Panaetiarius (ca. 1495). Three additional Latin versions appeared in the sixteenth century, all owing something to Burgundio (by Jacques Lefèvre d’Estatpes, Jacques de Billy, and Henry Grave) and another in 1712 (by M. Le Quien). The most influential by far of these versions was that of Burgundio. There are still extant at least 117 manuscripts of it. In addition, there are two thirteenth-century concordances which testify to its widespread use.\(^{43}\)

The revision of Burgundio’s translation by Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln, assured even greater use of John’s *De fide orthodoxa* with its large blocks of Nemesius’ text, especially in England. It was known to Roger Bacon (*Opus maius* [ed. 1900], I, 70; III, 84). Duns Scotus (ca. 1265–1308) also knew of the version, “translatio lincolniensis” (*Op. Oxon.*, III, dist. 21, no. 4 [ed. of 1639], VII.435). There are many other references to the “Lincoln” translation.\(^{44}\) Outside of England the monk Salimbene (1221–87) spoke in his *Chronicle* of this translation, “Hic (sc. Robertus Grossa Testa) secundo post Burgundionem iudicem Pisanim transitul Damascenum et . . . multos alios libros.” (MGH, SS XXXII.233).

Some translators of Nemesius stated plainly that they used *De fide orthodoxa* for their work, for example, Johannes Cono (see below, p. 57). He used the Latin version of his friend Jacques Lefèvre (and possibly a Greek text also). Ellebodius transposed the order of chapters XX and XXI; he mentioned that John had also done so. Modern editors, Matthei and Migne, have followed him in that order.

The reader may consult page 53 below for a selection of parallel texts that will permit comparison of Burgundio’s and Grosseteste’s versions of passages in *De fide orthodoxa* with the same ones in Burgundio’s Nemesius. On page 62 selections from Lefèvre’s (Faber’s) version of John are offered for comparison with Burgundio’s Nemesius and Cono’s revision of it. For a detailed study, see M. Morani, *La tradizione manoscritta*, pages 105–13.

To return to the translations of Nemesius, in 1165 Burgundio (who has been mentioned above in connection with John of Damascus), a lawyer from Pisa and a friend of the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa, made a Latin version of the *De natura hominis* and dedicated it to Frederick. More than ten years earlier, as already noted, Burgundio had made a Latin version of *De fide orthodoxa*; the passages in it from Nemesius represent a separate translation and were not used in the later complete translation of that author.\(^{45}\)

John of Salisbury (ca. 1115–80), as mentioned above, knew of Alfanus’ version though not under the author’s name. He also knew of some writings of his contemporary, Burgundio. He may have known his version of John, but since his *Metalogicon* was finished by 1159 and Burgundio’s Nemesius can be dated 1165, he was not referring to the latter when he mentioned the

\(^{42}\) See above, p. 35–36.

\(^{43}\) See the Introduction to Buytaert’s edition, pp. xx–xxii.


\(^{45}\) G. Verbeke and J. R. Moncho, eds., *Némésius d’Émèse*, *De natura hominis, traduction de Burgundio de Pise* (Leiden, 1975), LXXXIXff.
Pisan in *Metalogicon*, Book IV, chapter 7. But one of the Englishman’s contemporaries knew both Alfanus’ and Burgundio’s translations. He was Hugh of Honau, who was chaplain to the Emperor Frederick’s court. Hugh mentioned two translations of Nyssenus’ (sc. Nemesis’) treatise, that of Burgundio and that of another whose name he did not know (Alfanus), and he had copies of both versions at hand. Chapters X–XV of his *Liber de ignorantia* consist almost entirely of excerpts from Nyssenus (sc. Nemesis). For each passage Hugh selected the version he considered most accurate. Sometimes he inserted a single term or phrase from one version into the text of the other.  

Peter Lombard (ca. 1100–1160), despite assertions to the contrary, did not in his *Sententiarum libri quatuor* quote Nemesis in Burgundio’s version. Since Burgundio’s complete translation can be dated in 1165, after the death of Peter, he could have quoted Nemesis only from the passages in Burgundio’s version of John of Damascus, *De fide orthodoxa*. He did indeed quote from John’s work, but only from III.2–8, a section in which there are no Nemesis quotations, and he apparently quoted the translation of Cerbanus (ca. 1138–45) of III.1–8. Scholars suggest that later, while in Rome, Peter may have seen a draft of Burgundio’s version of John and made some emendations, but none of these involved a quotation of Nemesis.  

On the other hand, when on a number of occasions Alexander of Hales (d. 1245) quoted “Damascenus” he was unwittingly quoting Nemesis. He seems to have known the translation of Burgundio.  

Some of the most brilliant minds of the thirteenth century were familiar with *De natura hominis*, attributing it to Nyssenus since most used the version of Burgundio. The writings of Albert the Great 49 abound in instances of “Gregorius Nixenus [sic]” or “Nicenus et Johannes Damascenus dixerunt.” One may deduce that Albert had at hand when he wrote *Tractatus III de temperantia* both Burgundio’s translation of Nyssenus (sc. Nemesis) and his version of John of Damascus (see, for example, Q V, Art. 1, No. 4, Albertus Magnus, *Opera omnia*, vol. XXVIII, *De bono*, ed. C. Feckes (Münster, 1951), 196 and Q V, Art. 2, No. 41, 42, *ibid.*, 202). On occasion Albert quoted “Remigius” (see above, p. 33); the passages are from Nemesis; for example, *Opera omnia*, ed. Feckes, XXVIII, 219, 34–35 = PG XL, 673B. Albert’s famous pupil, Thomas Aquinas, does not often quote Nemesis verbatim. But E. Amman 52 pointed out that one cannot doubt that the *De natura hominis* underlay Thomas’ arguments in *Summa Theologicae* I from Q. LXXV to Q. LXXXIII and also Q. CXVI. There are numerous instances of paraphrasing; for example, *ST* I, Q. 103, Art. 6, Ob. 1. 53 Aquinas also compares Nyssenus (sc. Nemesis) and the Damascene; for example, *ST* I, Q. 82, Art. 5. a. 54  

The voluminous writings of the fifteenth-century scholar Dionysius the Carthusian (1402–71) contained many quotations and paraphrases of passages from Nemesis under the name of Nyssenus and most often coupled the name with that of John of Damascus as Albert had done before him. The reader can compare, for example, Dionysius, *Summa fidei orthodoxae*, 39–40.  


52. *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, XI, 1. 66. See also list in Morani, *La tradizione manoscritta*, 40–41.  


doxae, Lib. II, Art. XLIX, with Nemesius, ch. XXI (M, p. 234.8) and Io. Damascenus, De fide orthodoxa, ch. 30 (ed. Buytaert, p. 122.8) and with Aquinas, ST II, II, Q 158, Art. 5.3.

Toward the end of the fifteenth century (ca. 1485/94) the Italian encyclopedist Georgius Valla (1447–1500) made a Latin version of De natura hominis and correctly assigned it to Nemesius of Emesa. His translation was published posthumously in 1538, but his version and ascription of authorship were not widely known. In addition, Valla’s version of chapter II and a portion of chapter III, as they appeared in his De expetendis et fugiendis rebus opus (1501), hold the distinction of being the first printing of any portion of De natura hominis (see below, p. 55–56).

In Basel in the early sixteenth century, Johannes Cono was urged by his pupil Beatus Rheanus to revise Burgundio’s translation of De natura hominis. Cono did so and was responsible for a new division of the forty-two chapters into eight “books,” which resulted in a new title, Libri octo de Philosophia. Cono did not question Burgundio’s ascription of the treatise to Nyssenus. In a letter to J. Lefèvre (Faber Stapulensis), Beatus Rheanus mentioned that Faber himself had already in 1507 translated into Latin sizable portions of the work of Nyssenus (sc. Nemesius), which appeared in John of Damascus, De fide orthodoxa. Cono used this text along with other material in his efforts to revise Burgundio’s work without having available a complete Greek text.

Around the middle of the century an anonymous Italian scholar made a Latin translation of sixteen chapters of De natura hominis; he attributed them to Nemesius. His version remains unprinted.

Apart from the complete translations, the mid-sixteenth century provided another medium through which numerous quotations from Nemesius were read—the Centuriae Magdeburgenses (D. Flacius Illyricus). Most appear to be taken from Cono’s revision of Burgundio’s version. Selections from the chapters “De providentia,” “De libero arbitrio,” and “De volun-

tario et involuntario” were especially favored. Usually the text was copied verbatim although sometimes a few sentences considered unnecessary to prove a point were omitted. At times a larger section was paraphrased. The compilers of the Centuriae were not concerned about authorship and desired only to support their theses with statements from one or another of the fathers. They followed Cono in assigning the treatise to Nyssenus. By the end of the century the opponents of the Centuriators, Baronius, Bellarminus, and Possevius, recognized Nemesius as the true author of this material in the “Centuriés.”

After Cono’s translation of De natura hominis was printed, Burgundio was almost forgotten. By 1567, when Johannes Levvenkliaus wrote his introduction to his Latin version of Nyssenus, De opificio hominis, he clearly confused the translation of the genuine Nyssenus work by Dionysius Exiguus (s. VI) with Burgundio’s version of the Nemesius work. After seeing Ellebodius’ 1565 edition of De natura hominis, which was correctly ascribed to Nemesius, Levvenkliaus realized his error and persuaded Episcopius, the printer, to omit the Nemesius treatise from the 1571 edition of works of Nyssenus. Thus in 1571 for the first time an Opera omnia edition of Nyssenus was published that did not also contain the Nemesius work.

Nicasius Ellebodius, as was just mentioned, had published the editio princeps of the Greek text of Nemesius’ work, along with his own Latin version, in 1565. He knew Valla’s translation, but he did not mention Burgundio’s. Unfortunately, his dedication to Cardinal Perrenot was in Greek, which prevented its being widely read, though both he and the printer, Plantin, had brief Latin letters “To the Reader.” Ellebodius’ translation, with some emendations made by revisers who used additional manuscripts and Latin versions, was basically the one that appeared in all later editions.

No new edition of the entire work appeared for two centuries. But in 1615, in the Opera omnia edition of the works of Gregory Nyssenus, edited by Claudius Morellus with the assistance of Fronto Ducaeus, there could be found a little treatise, De anima, assigned to Nyssenus. It was nothing more or less than chapters II and III of

55. Theologia Damasceni, translation by Jacobus Faber Stapulensis (Paris, 1507; Venice, 1514; Basel, 1535, 1539); and with Clīctovē’s commentary (Paris, 1512, 1519).
56. See correspondence mentioned below under Cono, p. 57.
57. See CTC, V, Gregorius Nyssenus, p. 131, and PG XLIV, 1345ff.
Nemesius, *De natura hominis*. Claudius Morcellus had found it in a manuscript provided by Jacques Auguste de Thou in the Bibliothèque Royale in Paris. His brother Federicus made the Latin version. This portion of *De natura hominis* continued to be printed among Nysseus’ works in the editions of that author in 1638 and in the three subsequent editions of Migne’s *Patrologia Graeca* (see above, p. 68).

In 1671 the Oxford Sheldonian edition came out. It was little more than a hasty revision, generally thought to have been done by John Fell, bishop of Oxford, of Ellebodius’ translation with supplementary readings taken from several Bodleian manuscripts, one of which attributed the treatise to Adamantius. In 1788 Galland reprinted Fell’s revision in his *Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum*.

With the revival of interest in classical studies in the late eighteenth century, interest in Nemesius also increased. A new Greek-Latin edition appeared at Halle in 1802. Its editor was Christian Friedrich Matthaei, a Thuringian scholar who taught classics for a time in Moscow. While there he acquired a large collection of Greek manuscripts. Back in the West, he eventually taught at Wittenberg. He had apparently had an interest in Nemesius for some years. In the *Praefatio* to his edition, dated March 6, 1801, he commented on what he considered the poor quality of Ellebodius’ Greek text and that of the Oxford editor as well. He aimed at producing a “textum . . . emendatiorem (p. 4).” In May 1796 he collaborated two Augsburg manuscripts. In the same year he saw two more codices in Munich but was unable to study them, although when his edition was nearing completion, he received “varias lectiones” from these, which were sent to him by Ignatius Hardt, prefect of the Munich library. He inserted the information in his edition. Matthaei’s Latin text was based on Ellebodius, though he consulted independently Burgundio, Valla, and Fell as well as the excerpts in Anastasius of Sinai and John of Damascus. Matthaei’s edition, as it was reprinted by J. P. Migne in his *Patrologia*, became the standard reference, particularly because of its availability. The 1802 edition has recently been mechanically reprinted.

Today research on various aspects of Nemesius is continuing at a steady pace. Of special importance are new editions of the text. Work on a critical edition of the Greek text was begun before the middle of this century by Friedrich Lammert, but he did not live to finish it. Later Benedict Einarson worked on an edition and had almost completed it before his death in 1978. His text is being readied for publication by Phillip De Lacy, who is also preparing an English translation. Another critical edition, prepared by Moreno Morani, is being published in the *Bibliotheca Teubneriana*. G. Verbeke and J. Moncho brought out a critical edition of Burgundio’s Latin version in 1975. Morani has prepared an *Index verborum* for the Alfanus translation which parallels that in the new Burgundio edition. There is much scholarly activity in the area of Eastern-language versions (see above, p. 38). Thus at last in the twentieth century *De natura hominis* is again receiving much attention, and under the name of its true author, the obscure Nemesius, bishop of Emesa.

4. Western Vernacular Versions

The earliest Western vernacular translation was made by Domenico Pizzimenti into Italian, probably in the first half of the sixteenth century. It included only most of the first chapter, and it appeared in a volume also containing Pizzimenti’s version of a *Physiologus*. The exact date and place of publication are not indicated, but it probably was printed in Naples, certainly before 1559, at which time a reader made a note in a margin. There is a dedication to one Aurelia Carrafa in which the translator says he would have had the book printed abroad had not France closed the Adrian, which led E. Teza to conclude that the date might be related to the strife for control of Naples in the early years of the century, ca. 1509. 60 This date would appear to be too early in view of the few facts known about


60. Operetta d’un auctor incerto raccolta dal sapientiss. Salomone e dal gran Basilio, della natura degli animali, trad. da greco in volgare da Dom. Pizzimenti. Seven pages at the end of the *Physiologus* proper contain the material from Nemesius’ chapter I. The text is reproduced by Teza on pp. 1253–57 of his article, “La natura dell’uomo di Neme-
Pizzimenti’s life. It is noteworthy that Pizzimenti’s translation had as its source a text that attributed the treatise to its real author, Nemesius. After Pizzimenti’s translation, more than a century passed before George Wither, an obscure English poet, came into possession of copies of Valli’s and Ellebodius’ versions. He apparently could not read the original Greek; so he made an English translation from the Latin ones at hand. Some years later, before embarking on very different enterprises, Wither sold what was left of the printing of his version. In 1657 it turned up under the name of the bookseller, R. Croft, who had removed the introductory pages and added others of his own. The translation was, of course, Wither’s, not Croft’s. The story is told in detail by W. Telfer, who in 1955 produced a new English translation accompanied by an excellent introduction. A new English version is in preparation by Phillip De Lacy to accompany Einarson’s Greek text. There is an English version of John of Damascus, Fons scientiae, and hence of the sections from Nemesius included in the De fide orthodoxa portion of it, by F. H. Chase, Jr., entitled The Fount of Knowledge, published in the Fathers of the Church, vol. XXXVII (1958).

In 1791 G. G. Füllerborn made a German translation of some selections from De natura hominis, entitled “Von der Freiheit.” It was published in Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie, I (Münster, 1891), 81–90. In 1819 in Salzburg, W. Osterhammer published a German version of the first eleven chapters. Another German version, including all chapters and the prefaces of Alfanus and Burgundio, came out in Saarbrücken; it was the work of Emil Orth.

The only French translation was made by M. J. B. Thibault and published in 1844.

There is a Russian version by Theodor Vladimirs’kij, Nemesij episkop Emesskij, O prirode celoveka, perevod s greceskogo (1904).

There exists a French translation of the ps. Nemesius—Demetrius Cydones, De contem-

nenda morte, entitled Traité du mépris de la mort, traduit du grec de Cydonius en français, made by M. Menard and published in Paris in 1686.
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Genuine Work

I. De Natura Hominis

Translations

1. Alfanus Salernitanus

Alfanus, bishop of Salerno, made the earliest known Latin translation of Nemesius of Emesa,
De natura hominis. Alfanus’ death in 1085 gives a terminus ante quem for his version, but the exact date is unknown. It might be narrowed down, however, if one could identify the ruler (dominus) to whom his prologue is addressed. A secular rather than a religious leader would seem to be indicated. Gisulf of Salerno has been suggested. Alfanus did address a poem to him. Gisulf, however, was expelled from Salerno in 1076–77 by Robert Guiscard. Obviously, the addressee was Gisulf if the version was made prior to that date, but Guiscard if completed later. The latter possibility seems more likely since Robert Guiscard is known to have encouraged the development of the medical school already existing in Salerno. He also promoted Latin translations of Arabic and Greek medical works. He held in high esteem Constantinus Africanus, who translated from Arabic into Latin works of Hippocrates and Galen and who dedicated one of his works, De stomaco, to Alfanus. In addition, both Guiscard and Alfanus were supporters of Hildebrand (Pope Gregory VII).

In the surviving manuscripts Alfanus fails to name either the dedicatee or the Greek author. His own name appears in only one extant manuscript (Avranches, Bibliothèque de la Ville 221, s. XII ex.) and then only in the margin. He gave De natura hominis a new title, Premon Physicon (literally “Trunk of Natural Things” and rendered “Key to Nature” by Quasten and Telfer; “Key to Natural Things” by McKeon). Several variants appear in the manuscripts: prennon fisicon; prepon fisicon; fisicon protheron. In his prologue Alfanus explains the title: “Eritque ei (i.e., Nemesis’ treatise) titulus Premon physicon, hoc est Stipes naturalium, quia sicut ex uno stipite multi ramusculi pullulant, sic ex huius fonte doctrinae plurimi scientiae naturalium rivuli exuberant” (p. 3, ed. Burkhard). The now unknown Greek source of Alfanus may not have given the author’s name, or the translator may have had doubts about the individual named. This exemplar stemmed from family β, as did the source of Valla and Anonymus B as well as of the Georgian version. Friedrich Lammert suggested that Alfanus may have used the Lexicon of ps. Philoxenos in making his translation (see F. Lammert, “Über die Neuausgabe der Schrift des Nemesios von Emesa,” Hellenika, Paratema IX: 2–3 (1958) 169–77.

When Holzinger in 1887 first edited the Latin text of Alfanus, he used two manuscripts (Prague and Bamberg), which gave neither Nemesis’ nor Alfanus’ name. The following year Dittmeyer discovered the Avranches codex (s. XII) in which Nemesis’ name appeared in the margin as author and Alfanus’ name as translator; the hand of the scholiast probably can be dated as s. XIII. The prologue was missing from these manuscripts, but C. Baeumker found a s. XI manuscript in Paris which contained that part of the work. In 1917 C. J. Burkhard’s edition was published.

In manuscripts of Alfanus’ version chapter divisions are not indicated. Burkhard conveniently supplied them. The reader immediately notices that Alfanus’ translation is not complete. Moreover, the order of the chapters is irregular. The following list indicates Alfanus’, and hence probably his source’s, handling of the contents as contrasted with the current standard text of Matthaei.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alfanus</th>
<th>Matthaei</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I–XIX</td>
<td>I–XIX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XXI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII</td>
<td>XXII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII</td>
<td>XXVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV</td>
<td>XXVII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXV</td>
<td>XXIX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVI</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVII</td>
<td>XXXI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVIII</td>
<td>XXXII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIX</td>
<td>XXXIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXXIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXI</td>
<td>XXXIX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXII</td>
<td>XL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIII</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIV</td>
<td>XXVII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXV</td>
<td>XXV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXVI</td>
<td>XXIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXVII</td>
<td>XXIV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the influence of Alfanus’ version was not great either in his own or later times, it was more extensive than has generally been recognized. Within a century of Alfanus’ death it was quoted by Hugh of Honau (see above, p. 41). John of Salisbury seems to have known of it (see above, p. 40).

Of extant manuscripts one, Paris, BN, lat. 15, 078, was copied within a few years of Alfanus’ work on the version. Two others date within a century.

Prologus (ed. Burkhard, 1917). [Inc.]: (p. 1)
Cum constet hominem cunctis sibi subditis in-nata ratione praestare eum nesse est vel hac exserta eorum dominari, vel hac depressa ipsis adaequari. Unde unumqueque oportet eniti medulla tenus disciplinis studiisque rationem in-tendere, ne statuatur famuli magis ut bruta ani-malia, quam principari ut ratione utentia. Et tibi quidem in hoc, domine, tanto praeceter curio-sius adlaborandum est, quanto cum ceteris hominibus quoque ipsis imperare decerneris. . . . Quia igitur et abicienda et recipienda non sine rata ratione deligentur atque improbabun-tur, cumque probabilis ad haec atque demonstrativis satagendum ut argumentis: liberalium artium documenta huic libello necessaria pro aedificatione conferentur ut effectiva instrumenta, ipsis quoque postmodum artibus non parum profutura, nec ipsis quidem solummodo, sed medicinae quoque divinaeque doctrinae. Et ut dicam compendiosius, quamvis physicae abscindentis sit principalis, ab omnibus tamen philosophicis demulcet uberos ipsi quoque matri praestabit fortem et non ex toto inutilum. Eritque ei titulus Premon physicorum, hoc est Sti-pes naturalium, quia ex huius fonte doctrinae plurimi scientiae naturalium rivuli exuberabunt . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (p. 4) Probator etenim non minore quam auctor donaberis merito. Sic equi-dem et aemulorum hiantia ora picae offa compesces et a virosis eorum morsibus tuum prudentem tueberis clientulum.

Text. Chapter I. [Inc.]: (p. 5) Multis et prudentibus viris confirmatum est hominem ex anima intelligibili et corpore tam bene compositum, ut nequaquam oportuerit eum aliiter fieri vel consistere . . . / . . . [Expl.]: Ch. I: (p. 23) Sed quia hominem ex anima esse et corpore praece-dens sermo propositus, prius de anima incipia-mus, dereliquentes ea, quae valide sunt subtilia et difficilia plurimisque inquitibus ignota.

Chapters II–III. [Inc.]: (p. 23) Non ignotum est antiquorum sententias de anima esse divers-sas. Democritus namque et Epicurus et omnis Stoicorum secta animam esse corpus fatetur . . . / . . . [Expl.] Ch. III: (p. 58) Gradus autem animarum et ascensiones et descendiones quas Origines induct, nihil obaudiantes divinis scripturis neque accedentes Christianorum doctrinis praetereundum est.

Chapter IV. [Inc.]: (p. 59) Omne corpus ex quattuor elementis est composum et ex his fac-tum est. Singulariter autem sanguineorum ani-malium corpora ex quattuor humoribus con-
stant: sanguine, phlegmate rubeaque cholera et nigra . . . / . . . [Expl.]: Ch. XXIV, ‘De pulsibus (Alfanus’ final chapter): (p. 146) Sed elevata quidem a vicinis venus cum violentia trahit sanguinem subtilem, qui vaporans nutrimentum sit spiritui vitali, deposita autem, fumositates, quae sunt in ipsa, movet per totum corpus et per poros invisibles, quemadmodum cor per eos et per nares in expirationibus eicit suas fumositates.

Bibliography:

Manuscripts:

(*) Bamberg, Staatliche Bibliothek M.IV.16 (Klass. I); s. XIII, fols. 45v–69 (Cat. Bamberg L.2 (1895), p. 2; Burkhard, praeuf., p. vii; and Holzinger, praef., pp. iiff.).


(*) London, BL Harley, 3969; s. XII, fols. 168–96 (Cat. Nares III, p. 100). The title is “phisicon protheron.” This ms. contains the marginal notes of Thomas Baker (1656–1740).

(*) Paris, BN lat. 15,078; s. XI ex.–XII in., fols. 111v–190v, 191–200 (see L. Delisle, Bib-liothèque de l’École des Chartes, XXX (1869), 71; Burkhard, praeuf., p. vi).
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Editions:
1917, Leipzig: (Bibliotheca Teubneriana) Nemesis eipiscopi Premmon Physicon sive περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου liber ab Alfrano in Latinum translatus, ed. C. J. Burkhard. NUC. BL; BN; (CU; DLC; IU; MH).

Biography:
Alfanus came from a noble family of southern Italy, possibly related to the Guaimar. The date of his birth cannot be precisely established, although it can reliably be placed between 1015 and 1020 (A. Lentinii, in Dizionario biografico degli italiani, II [1960], 253). Alfanus' education included the study of literature, music, philosophy, science, and religion. He acquired a well-deserved reputation as a poet. His interest and skill in the field of medicine left its mark on the two famous institutions with which he was associated during his lifetime.

In 1056 Alfanus entered the monastery of Monte Cassino at the behest of Desiderius, later Pope Victor III (1086-87), who had received medical advice from him. Desiderius presided over what has been called the Golden Age of Monte Cassino. He became abbot in 1058, a year after Alfanus' departure for San Benedetto, Salerno, of which Guisulf, prince of the region, had asked him to become abbot. Frederic of Lorraine, who in 1057 became Pope Stephen IX, was also at Monte Cassino during Alfanus' stay there. Alfanus' name continued to be associated with the famous monastery long after he had gone on to other responsibilities. Its medical school and that at Salerno were closely allied. One of Alfanus' friends in the latter was Constantinus Africanus, who went on to Monte Cassino, where he gained fame as a translator of medical works from the Arabic into Latin. A lasting memorial for Alfanus at Monte Cassino were the poetic lines from his pen which Desiderius had caused to be inscribed over the apse and main arch of the monastery (see H. E. J. Cowdrey, The Age of Abbot Desiderius [Oxford, 1983], 15, n. 73).

In 1058 Alfanus was named archbishop of Salerno by the aforementioned Stephen IX (1057-58). In 1059 he attended the council at Rome called by Pope Nicolas II (1059-61) at which assembly the procedure for papal elections was revised and the theological controversy surrounding the conflicting views of Berengarius and Lanfranc was discussed. Twenty years later the same issues were brought up, and settled, at another council also attended by Alfanus. At the 1059 gathering he met Hildebrand, later Pope Gregory VII, although it was to be many years before they established a lasting friendship.

Alfanus was closely associated with the next pope, Alexander II (1061-73). In 1062 he accompanied Guisulf, the Lombard prince, to Constantinople and proceeded on to Jerusalem, a pilgrimage he had long intended to make but which now took on political undertones. Returning to Constantinople, he suspected Guisulf of trying to kill him and went back to Italy secretly, eventually to cast his lot with the party of Guiscard, the Norman, although he was reconciled with Guisulf for a time. Facts and speculations about Alfanus' involvements in the politico-religious strife of the era can be sorted out only by consulting some of the excellent detailed studies available (see Bibliography below). Alfanus was a participant in the important ecclesiastical gatherings of the time: the council of Melfi in 1067, the council of Salerno in 1068, and those held in Rome in 1074 and 1079.

In 1077 the Normans triumphed and Salerno fell to Robert Guiscard and his supporters. Alfanus, who had previously for the most part taken an anti-Norman position, and his friend of many years Desiderius, who had been largely pro-Norman, joined in promoting concord between Guiscard and Hildebrand, who in 1073 had become Pope Gregory VII and was eager for a cessation of the strife.

Alfanus was credited in 1080 with rediscovering the relics of St. Matthew and with Guiscard's aid rebuilt the cathedral bearing the saint's name in Salerno. It was dedicated by Gregory VII in his final days. When Guiscard aided the embattled pope to safety at Salerno after his attempts at settling differences with Henry IV had failed, it was Alfanus who sheltered him during his exile until his death in 1085. Some months later Desiderius reluctantly succeeded Gregory. Alfanus himself died on October 9, 1085, and was buried in the cathedral at Salerno.

Works: In addition to the Latin version of Nemesius, De natura hominis, Alfanus was responsible for a number of other writings, both
poetry and prose. The majority are listed by Peter Deacon in his biography (PL, CLXXIII, 1030–31): Passio S. Christinae and two hymns on the same; verses on St. Benedict and St. Peter, Apostle; the Song of St. Sabina; In laudem monachorum Casinensium; De situ, constructione ac renovatione eiusdem coenobii; verses on St. Maurus; three hymns on St. Matthew (the discovery of whose bones was credited to Alfanus by Pope Alexander II), two hymns on St. Fortunatus and on St. Nicolaus; on the church of St. John Baptist in Cassino; many epitaphs on famous men. Mari (in his edition of Peter Deacon) adds that there were also in the monastery of Monte Cassino (plut. 8, sinistr.) three other works of Alfanus: De unione corporis et animae, liber unus, which according to Capparoni refers to the like-titled chapter of Nemesius; De quattuor humoribus corporis humani, liber unus; De unione Verbi Dei et hominis, liber unus (apparently lost). A De pulsibus, sometimes attributed to Alfanus, is not his work, but could be a later reworking of a treatise, perhaps an expansion of Nemesius’ chapter of like title (XXIV) with which Alfanus ends his translation of De natura hominis. In some editions of Surius under September 1, there is an item attributed to Alfanus: Passio sanctorum martyrorum duodecim Fratrum Beneventanorum, ad fratum Rufodium Casinense monachum. In addition to the above, Thordike mentions two unpublished items: Tractatus Alfani Salernitani de quibusdam medicinalibus (Canterbury, Christchurch, no. 1903, s. XIV) and Experimenta archiepiscopi Salernitani (Cambridge, Trinity College, 1365, s. XI in.).


2. Burgundio Pisano

Burgundio of Pisa made a Latin translation of De natura hominis, probably in 1165. He used a Greek manuscript that closely resembled Vatican, Chis. R. IV.13 (s. X–XI), in which the treatise is assigned to Gregory of Nyssa. Hence Burgundio and all who later used this version name Nyssenus as author. The Vatican manuscript contains marginal notes giving the Latin translations for selected Greek terms. Even though these translations correspond in many cases to those of Burgundio, the notes might be by a later scholiast since Burgundio’s version exhibits a number of divergences from the Greek of Chisianus R. IV.13. M. Morani is devoting further study to the connection of this manuscript with Burgundio. The Pisan’s translation was quoted in his own day by another member of the circle around Frederick Barbarossa, Hugh of Honau (in his Liber de ignorantia, cap. X).

Burgundio dedicated his version to the emperor. Around 1154–55 Burgundio had a conversation with Frederick during which the emperor expressed a desire to learn more about the “nature of things.” His wish was fulfilled when Burgundio and some others in court circles made translations from the Greek (see J. de Ghellinck, L’essor de la littérature latine au XIIème siècle, 2 vols. [Paris, 1946], II, 31–32, and p. 41 above).

One can hardly overemphasize the importance of Burgundio’s versions, both the partial one (ca. 1146–54, most likely 1153–54) of the large blocks of the Nemesius work included in John of Damascus, De fide orthodoxa, and the complete one of 1165. The former was revised by Robert Grosseteste (ca. 1235–40) and the latter by Johannes Cono (see below, p. 57).

Burgundio’s method of translation, as he

After the treatment of the *De natura hominis*, the reader will find for purposes of comparison three translations of the same Greek passage: (a) Burgundio’s translation in the *De fide orthodoxa*, (b) the revision by Robert Grosseteste of this translation, and (c) Burgundio’s translation in the *De natura hominis* (see below, pp. 52–53).

The chapter divisions in Burgundio’s translation differ somewhat from those in the present standard text of Matthaei. A list of correspondence follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burgundio</th>
<th>Matthaei</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I–III</td>
<td>I–III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>IV–V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V–XVIII</td>
<td>VI–XIX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI–XL</td>
<td>XXII–XLI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLI (to p. 158.50) of Matthaei</td>
<td>XLII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLI (p. 158.50–159.66) of Matthaei</td>
<td>XLIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLII</td>
<td>XLIV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dedication* (ed. Verbeke and Moncho, 1975). D ominatori Frederico invictissimo Romanorum Imperatori et Caesari semper Augusto, a Burgundione, iudice natione Pisano, translatis incept liber, anno incarnationis Domini MCLXV, indictione XIII. Invictissimo et gloriosissimo domino Frederico, Dei gratia Romanorum Imperatori et Caesari semper Augusto, Burgundio iudex natione Pisanus fidelitatem et de inimicis triumphum. *[Inc.]:* (p. 1) Quia in meiis, serenissime Imperator, Vocibscum locutionibus naturas rerum cognosce rerum causas scire V estrum Maiestatem velle perpendi, idcirco librum hunc Sancti Gregorii episcopi Nyssae, fratris Sancti Basilii, de Graeco in Latinum V estro nomine statui transcrire sermonem. In quo philosophice de natura hominis pertractat, de corpore, de anima, de unitione utrorumque, de imaginativo et discretivo et memorativo et de irrationali, quod est vel pars vel vis vel potestia animae nostrae rationalis . . . . . . . [Expl.]: (pp. 2–3) Si in his Vostro exercitari persenere, et altiora Vobis transerere curabo: de corpore caeli, de forma et motu eius et de omnibus passionibus quae sunt a caelo deorsum, ut de lacteo circulo et comitis et venitis et coruscationibus et tonitruis et iride et pluvis et grandine et pruna, et cur mare salsum est et cur tot fluminibus influentibus nec augetur nec dulcoratur, et de terrae motu qualler fiat. Quae omnia si Vestro intervenire V estris temporibus in lucem Latinis redacta fuerint, immensam gloriari et aeternum nomen Vestra Maiestas consequetur et Vesta res publica utilitatem maximam adipiscetur. Hunc igitur librum fideliter translatum et, ut potui, studiose emendatum V estreae celsitudini porrigo, me meaque Vestro servitio offerens, praedicta vero et si quia alia praecipius, ad voluntatem Vestram perficere sum paratus, quia Vobis in omnibus fidelis ac devotus existo.

*De natura hominis*. Chapter I. *[Inc.]:* (p. 4) Hominem ex anima intellectuali et corpore optime constructum et ita bene quod non conveniebat aliter genitum esse, multis et sapientibus viris visum est. Ex eo autem quod intellectualis dicitur anima dubitationem habente, utrum adveniens intellectus animae ut alius alii intellectualam eam fecit, vel intellectualae a se ipsa et natura anima habet . . . . . . . [Expl.] Chapter I (pp. 22–23): Quia vero hominem ex anima esse et corpore communis submittit sermo, age dividentes prius de anima tractemus eas quae valde subtiles et feminiae et quae multis difficiles intelligibilis quaestionum sunt, dereliquentes.

Chapter II. *[Inc.]:* *De anima* (p. 23) Dissonat autem omnibus fere antiquis is qui de anima sermo. Nam Democritus quidem et Epicurus et omnis Stoicorum philosophorum coetus corpus animam enuntiavit . . . . . . . [Expl.]: Chapter III (p. 57) Gradus enim animarum et ascensiones et descensiones, quas Origenes inducit, nullo convenientes divinis scripturis neque concordantes Christianorum dogmatibus, relinquentes sunt.

Chapter IV. *[Inc.]:* (p. 58) *De corpore*. Omne corpus quattuor elementorum est concretio et ex his factum est. Proxime vero sanguineorun animalium corpora ex quattuor humoribus genita sunt: sanguine, phlegmate, rubra cholera et nigra . . . . . . . [Expl.]: Chapter XLII. (p. 170) Eadem et in invasoribus et rapientibus pecunias; etenim his quibus auferuntur, ut decret, confert non possidere; sed avari qui rapuerunt, iniusti
sunt; propter avaritiam enim, non propter utilitatem illorum abstulerunt. Beati Gregorii Episcopi Nyssae liber explicit.

**Bibliography:**


**Manuscripts:**


(photo.) Firenze, Biblioteca Riccardiana. 152 (N III, 29): s. XV, misc., fol. 97. Three excerpts corresponding to the text in Verbeke and Moncho, *Némésius*, 147, 92–93; 163, 65–66; 169, 14–17. P. O. Kristeller assisted with the transcription of the text. He noted that the collection of the texts for this manuscript is attributed to Bartholomaeus Fontius. The majority of items are from Latin authors. A photo was provided through the kindness of Millicent Phillips of Firenze (Kristeller, *Iter*, I, 188; S. Caroti and S. Zamponi, *Lo scrittoio di Bartolomeo Fanzio*, Documenti delle Arti del Libro X [Milan, 1974], 41–45).


**Editions:**


**Editions of Epistola Nuncupatoria only:**


1968, New York: Reprint of the above. NUC. (CU).

Three translations of part of *De natura hominis*, Chapter, *De ira*.


Species autem irae sunt tres: ira quae vocatur fel, et mania, et cotus (id est furore). Ira enim principium et motum habens, iva et fel vocatur. Mania vero est fel permanens, scilicet memoria mali; dictur autem a manendo et a memoriae
tradendo. Cotus autem (id est furor) est iva observans tempus ad vindictam; dicetur autem a kisthe (id est ab iniacendo).

Est autem iva id quod audax est mentis, vindex concupiscientiae. Cum enim concupiscimus quid et prohibemur ab aliquo, irascimur adversus eum ut iniusta passi, mente scilicet iudicante dignum angustia quo factum est, in custodientibus secundum naturam proprium ordinem.


**Biography:**

Burgundio was born early in the twelfth century, possibly around 1110, in Pisa; hence he is usually referred to as Pisanus. There is no reliable evidence for assigning either Johannes or Ricardus as a first name, nor for Burgundius Bernardus Cremonensis, which appears in one manuscript (of his Latin version of the Pan dettae). A manuscript of his translation of Chrysostom’s *Commentaries on Matthew* calls him Burgundio Leulus, civis Pisanus, possibly confusing him with a nephew of that name. Johannes probably came about because of the Cardinal Johannes Burgundio of the preceding century. The basis for “Ricardus” used by Beatus Rhenanus is not apparent.

Little is known of Burgundio’s early life. His education was in all likelihood received in his native Pisa. By 1135 he had acquired a reputation as a lawyer and also for his facility in the Greek language. From 1135 to 1138 he was in Constantinople, along with Moses of Bergamo and Jacob of Venice, as an interpreter in the discussions between the Greek and Latin churches. The talks were directed by Anselm of Havelberg, who wrote of them in his *Dialogi I.II. c. 1* (PL, CLXXXVIII, 1163). In 1146 Burgundio was named an “advocatus” of Pisa and in 1155 a “publicus iudex” of that town. In 1152 he was named an “iudex” of the Lateran Palace. Around 1154–55, he must have met Frederick Barbarossa, who may have learned of him through Anselm’s *Dialogi*. He dedicated several works to the emperor, among them his translation of the De natura hominis. He also dedicated some other translations to Henry VI and to Pope Alexander III. There is no proof that Burgundio taught law, as some have suggested. Moreover, it cannot be proved that Hugh Etherian was his pupil. It is known that he undertook a number of diplomatic missions for the city of Pisa. In 1169 he went to Ragusa to conclude a treaty between that city and Pisa. He proceeded on to Constantinople as a representative of his native city and remained until 1171. On his return he was again sent out, this time to Messina, Naples, and Gaeta. He was present at the Third Lateran Council in Rome in 1179. On this occasion he presented his translation of Chrysostom’s *Homilies on the Gospel of John* to the curia. He made a final journey to Constantinople in 1192. He died on October 30, 1193, and was buried in St. Paul’s on the Arno. Of his four sons two survived him.
Works: No original work is extant under Burgundio’s name with the exception of his dedicatory letters. His talents lay in making Greek writings available to the Western world by way of his Latin versions. Classen (see Bibliography below) calls attention to the parallel activity of Burgundio for Greek works and that of his contemporary, Gerard of Cremona, for Arabic writings. In addition to his translations of Nemesius and John of Damascus, Burgundio made Latin versions of Johannes Chrysostomus, Homiliae in Matthaeum, in Ioannem, in Genesim; Basilii Magnus, in Isaian (largely lost); Hippocrates, Aphorismoi; Galen, ten works; Pandectae, the Greek passages. Some other fragmentary and doubtful translations have been attributed to Burgundio, among them the Geoponica; Gregorius Nazianzenus, Apologia de fuga (see Dausend, p. 355, and F. Liotta, “Burgundione,” Dizionario biografico degli italiani, XV [1972], 427). A version of the nine authentic homilies of Basil, In Hexaemeron, preserved in several manuscripts, has been attributed to Burgundio by some (see Liotta, “Burgundione,” 426). Oudin’s statement that he translated John of Damascus, Logica, Elementarium de duabus naturis, and other works, is without foundation. P. Classen’s detailed discussion of the works of Burgundio is found on pp. 34ff. (see Bibliography).


3. Anonymus A

An anonymous Latin translation of most of chapter V, De elementis (from M. 150.7 through 170.7) of the De natura hominis is found in a late twelfth-century manuscript, British Library, Cotton, Galba E. IV (I am indebted to Thomas P. Halton for calling my attention to this translation.) The passage had long been unrecognized as Nemesius’ work by scholars who used the manuscript until in 1965 it was identified by Richard C. Dales.

Dales dated the manuscript ca. 1190–1200. The codex was compiled for, perhaps written by, the monks of Bury St. Edmunds. It contains a number of works: several on the elements, a Liber physiognomiae and Adelard of Bath’s important Quaestiones; in addition, a few folia beyond the translation of chapter V (fols. 200–201) on fols. 205–14 is the complete version of De natura hominis by Alfanus, entitled here Prenon phisicon. The copyist seems to have been unaware of the duplication of material if not of translation. Dales suggested that the collection may have been put together by a scientist for teaching purposes.

One cannot rule out the faint possibility that the Nemesius chapter was excerpted from a complete version, now lost. The unknown translator showed greater freedom in his Latin style than was usual at a time when translations from the Greek were generally quite literal, and trans-literations, rather than translations, of Greek scientific terms were common. This is not the only occasion in which chapter V was excerpted, and an editor in 1537 inserted Cono’s version of it into an edition of Gregory of Nyssa, De opificio hominis (see CTC, V, 121). The popularity of the chapter stems from its being a convenient compendium of classic Greek scientific thought on “the elements.”

De natura hominis, chapter V, De elementis (ed. of 1966). [Inc.]: (p. 14) Elementum in mundo tocius est corporis minima pars. Elementa quatuor sunt, id est, terra aqua aer ignis. Talis enim ordo ab inferioribus ad superiorem a minus dignis ad digniora factus videtur. Hec quattuor corpora sunt simplicia quoddammodo ad eorum quod constituent comparationem . . . / . . . [Expl]: (p. 19) Quod ut supra dixi
sapientes suis rationibus approbarent. Quicquid tamen dicant, confirmantur eadem elementa vicissim mutabilia esse. Quia cum sit, mutabilia necesse est omnia esse elementa. Quodcumque enim horum accipies, alterum ab altero nasci videbis. Explicit.
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4. Georgius Valla
Georgius Valla made a Latin translation of Nemesis, De natura hominis, at some time before his death in 1500. The manuscript from which it was published in 1538 was found in the library of Georgius Merula (d. 1494), the humanist and classical scholar of Venice, so it seems probable that the version was made after Valla’s arrival in Venice in 1485 and not later than 1494, the year of Merula’s death. Gaudentius Merula, who had the translation published by Sebastian Gryphius of Lyons almost half a century later, dedicated the volume to Jacobus Philippus Sacchus, president of the senate of Lombardy.

It may be that Valla came across the De natura hominis while compiling material for his encyclopedic work in forty-nine books, De experimentis et fugiendis rebus opus. This project was not completed until July 1498, but work must have been going on for several years previously. M. Verhelst has pointed out that chapter 1 and the last two-thirds of chapter 9 of Book XLVI of De experimentis contain Valla’s translation of Nemesis’ chapter II (De anima) and the first half of chapter III (De iunctione corporis et animae) (see M. Verhelst, “Georges Valla, com-

pilateur de Nicéphore Blemmyde,” Diotima, VIII [1980], 144–46). She states that the translation as it appears in chapter XLVI is not exactly the same as that found in Valla’s version as printed in the 1538 edition of his translation of the entire work. There is no way of knowing whether the case is analogous to that of Burgundio (see above, p. 40), or whether the differences arose in the editing process.

It is noteworthy that Valla’s exemplar attributed the De natura hominis to Nemesis, not to Nyssenus as had Burgundio’s Greek manuscript. Valla’s version was not widely known because for almost thirty years after the publication of the complete Latin translation in 1538, Nemesis’ treatise continued in most circles to be assigned to Nyssenus.

Valla’s translation has been called defective by Ellebodius and by some modern scholars; however, he made no claim to be a philosopher or literary person; he was a scientist and an encyclopedist.

Valla’s version is divided into forty-three chapters. He combined the material in chapters XIV and XV into a single chapter.

Valla
Matthaei
I–XIII
I–XIII
XIV
XIV–XV
XV–XLIII
XVI–XLIV

Dedication (ed. of Lyons, 1538). Iulissimso et excellentissimo D. Iacobo Philippo Saccho Caesarei Senatus amplissimi apud Insubres Gallos Praeside ac Moderatori iustissimo Gaudentius Merula S.D. [Inc.]: (p. 3) Statueram iamdiu aliquod ad te, ex quo meam erga te observantiam vel me tacente cognosceres, munus, quod et tuae amplitudini et professioni meae foret idoneum, mittere. Numquam tamen facere id licuit mihi, quod ea quae ex officina nostra exente, tuo videantur intuïtui prorsus indigna, et quae tua sunt maiestate digna, ex farina (quod aiunt) vix sint nostra. Quamobrem hae super angebar maxime idque facturum me numquam sperassse, nisi desperatis Fortuna salutem prope rebus attulisset. Siquidem Georgii Merulae viri candidissimi et de Repub. litteraria tam bene meriti, quam qui maxime, bibliothecam mihi revolventi, statim Nemesis occurrit quem cum raptim legissem, tuis dignum manibus munus existimavi quod sit homini vel moribus vel aetate composito opere (prout mea furt sententia) isto conducibilios nihil, ei prae-

De natura hominis. Chapter I. [Inc.]: (p. 7) Hominem ex anima intellecta, et corpore absolutissime definitum, et tam recte ut ne alter quidem definiri posse videatur, multi et boni viri censuere. At cum intellectiva ipsum constare anima definimus, ambiguum sane videri potest, utrum animam subiens intellectus, tamquam alius, aliam fecerit intellectivam, an intelligentiam ipsam anima, et natura suapte assecuta sit . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (p. 27) Denique cum ex anima et corpore hominem constare, ut ostensum, communis omnium sit opinio, nos iam quae restant, prosequamur, primum de anima tractantes, valide tenuia, ac minutatim descripta, et a multis difficulter intellectiva exquirentibus relinquamus. Chapter II, de anima. [Inc.]: (p. 27) De anima veterum prope omnium inter se dissertit oratio. Democritus enim et Epicurus, et totum Stoicorum concilium, corpus esse definiunt. [Expl.] Chapter III, de animae et corporis copula: (p. 63) Enimvero animarum gradus ascensus atque descensus, quos inducit Origenes, utpote divinis scripturis non conducentes, neque Christianorum convenientes sententias, relinquamus. Chapter IV. [Inc.]: (p. 64) Corpus omne quatuor elementorum concretio et ex eis progenitum est. Et animalium quidem sanguinem habentium continuo corpus ex quatuor coitum humoribus, sanguine, phlegmate, flava bile et atra . . . / . . . [Expl.] Chapter XLIII. (p. 188) Quae quamquam iis quibus sublatae sunt, quippe quod illorum merito factum sit, conferat eam nequaquam habuisse, verum tamen fuit in acervum cumulare inusti, nam tales ideo ei rei student, quo accumulent, non ut auferendo illis commodum pariant. Finis.
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Biography:
Johannes Stabius, the mathematician, had discovered a manuscript of Burgundio’s translation of the De natura hominis. When Cono learned that it had come into the hands of Matthias Schurer for printing, he expressed reluctance to see such a poor version published. Rhenanus urged him to revise it. Cono proceeded to occupy himself with that task during the winter of 1511–12. One scholar (Saffrey) has offered the interesting suggestion that the project may have been a subject of discussion in Cono’s Greek classes during that period. Some detail is available in the correspondence of the scholars. When Cono began his work he did not have available a complete Greek manuscript of De natura hominis in the library of the Dominican convent in Basel, where he resided after 1510. He had at hand as primary sources only Burgundio’s Latin version and a partial Greek text. Scholars have demonstrated that this was Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. E. 1, 6 (s. XIII according to Hunt; s. XIV according to Coxe). It had belonged to John Stoković of Ragusa (1390–1443). He had acquired it while in Constantinople as a member of a delegation from the Council of Basel, which was working for the reunion of the Greek and Latin churches. There between 1435 and 1437, Nicolaus of Cusa borrowed it from Stoković. It may well contain Cusanus’ notes (see Krchňák, Bibliography, below). Stoković will this and his other manuscripts to the Dominican convent at his death (1443). It was there in 1511 that Stabius called Rhenanus’ attention to it. On fols. 364–74v it contained chapters II and III of De natura hominis under the caption, Different Opinions of philosophers and Christians on the soul and a true exposition of these. Following this item is an unversed work, the incipit of which indicates that it is chapter XXIV, the medical explanation of pulses, of the Nemesis treatise. The next item is likewise unascribed. Its title is De spermate ex Aristotele et Galeno. The incipit indicates that it is Nemesis, chapter XXV, concerning the generative faculty. Thus Cono had a Greek text of these four chapters at hand, but whether he recognized the latter two as belonging to the same treatise as did the De anima is not known. For the rest of his work he relied on Burgundio’s Latin and the long passages quoted by John of Damascus in his De fide orthodoxa. He used Faber’s Latin version of this work and perhaps a Greek manuscript as well, today’s Sélestat, Bibliothèque Humaniste, 106 (see Sicherl, pp. 66ff. and 136ff., Bibliography.
below). Cono tells us that he also used Basil’s *In Hexaemeron* together with scholia of Elias of Crete. Cono’s use of Basil’s work was influenced by his knowledge that Basil and Nyssenus (sc. Nemesius) had used a common source, and possibly because he considered Basil’s brother to be the author of *De natura hominis*. The Greek text of Basil’s *In Hexaemeron* was available in the same manuscript that contained part of the treatise he was working on (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. E. 1.6). The scholia of Elias to which he referred were those written by the Greek theologian and canonist (s. XI ex.–XII in.) on nineteen orations of Gregory Nazianzen; they were available in several manuscripts in the Dominican convent library, although there is evidence for the use of only one of them by Cono (see Sicherl, p. 136, Bibliography, below). The scholia were printed following each sermon in the 1583 edition of Nazianzen’s works.

In addition to these written and printed sources Cono also had the assistance of Beatus Rhenanus, who, “working day and night because the printers were asking for the promised copy,” himself made a copy of Cono’s version, smoothing out as he did so some still remaining roughness of style (stilium ubique evexi), which he feared might cause readers to peruse the text superficially, “ne tam rustica barbarice deterriti lectores, veluti de Nilo canes, ut vetus verbum usurpem, biberent et surgerent,” (see A. Horawitz and K. Hartfelder, *Briefwechsel des Beatus Rhenanus* [Leipzig, 1886], 44). Jodocus Badius Ascensius also, in his letter to Rhenanus which prefaces the 1513 edition of *Libri octo*, says that he owed much to Rhenanus: “tibi qui et auxisti et expolvisti” (see Ph. Renouard, *Bibliographie des impressions et des oeuvres de Josse Badius Ascensius*, 3 vols. [Paris, 1908], II, 477). But in spite of the labors of both men a substantial improvement over Burgundio’s earlier effort was not evident (Matthaei, p. 12; Burkhard, “Hand-chriftliche Überlieferung von Nemesius,” *Wiener Studien*, X (1888), 132ff.; Verbeke and Moncho, *Némésius*, xcvi). Nevertheless, Cono had produced the first complete printed edition of Nemesius, though in Latin only.

Finally, Cono was concerned about the spelling of Nyssenus’ name and about the correctness of titles of works. Five days after dedicating his version of Nyssenus’ (sc. Nemesius’) work to Beatus Rhenanus, he wrote a dedication for his translation of Nyssenus, *Oratio 11* (Ad Gregorium Nyssenum) to Thomas Truchses, vicar-general of Speyer. In it he expressed his distress with the careless copying of authors’ names and of the titles of their works. “Error enim nominis usque adeo nocere solet ut huius mutatione conditio et qualitas personae deprimatur. Quamobrem non parum profecto admirandum venit, quo nam oestro perciti quidem scioli nostrae tempestatis tam leviter et inhumane in priscos illos innocentissimos authores desaequivant, quorum nomina invertunt, transponunt, titulos inscriptionum corrupunt. . . . Denique ut alterius nomen corruptum quærar, cuius gratia haec tuae excellentiæ scribere coepi, Gregorius, is est Nyssenus sive Nysae [sic] episcopus, cuius sane felicitatem ipsa impensa fortuna varie quidem quamquam frustra tentavit. Nam cum illius sancti et eruditissimi viri praeclarus in philosophia liber, quem a graeco nuper fonte, magna ex parte emaculatum intuebere, longo postliminio a situ et squalore, inventione Io(hannis) Stabii mathematici rursus emergeret, nomen illius et laudis titular, authoritates denique cepit [sic] demergi. Cuius vero incuria vel libidine potius id gestum sit, non constat. Id scio quod pro Gregorio Nyseno, vel Nysseno, Gregorius Emissenus substitutos est.”

To permit the reader to judge the extent and character of Cono’s revision of Burgundio’s translation, several portions of the *De natura hominis* in his version as well as in that of Burgundio will be found following the treatment of the text.

Cono’s division of the text as compared with that of Burgundio and Matthaei follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cono</th>
<th>Burgundio</th>
<th>Matthaei</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liber I, De homine</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liber II, De anima</td>
<td>II and III</td>
<td>II and III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liber III, De elementis</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>IV–V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liber IV, De viribus animae</td>
<td>V–XXVIII</td>
<td>VI–XXVIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liber V, De voluntario et involuntario</td>
<td>XXVIII–XXXIII</td>
<td>XXIX–XXXIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liber VI, De fato</td>
<td>XXXIV–XXXV</td>
<td>XXXV–XXXVII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liber VII, De libero arbitrio</td>
<td>XXXVII–XXXVIII</td>
<td>XXXIX–XL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liber VIII, De providentia</td>
<td>XLI–XLII</td>
<td>XLII–XLIV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Divini Gregorii Nyssae Episcopi qui fuit frater Basili Magni Libri Octo. I. De homine. II. De anima. III. De elementis. IV. De viribus animae. V. De voluntario et involuntario. VI. De fato. VII. De libero arbitrio. VIII. De providentia. (The elaborate title page is described in detail by Horawitz and Hartfelder, Briefwechsel des Beatus Rhenanus, 599.)

On the reverse of the title page is a Latin poem by Johannes Stabius to Johannes Graccus in which he thanks God for giving his blessing to this work of Gregory of Nyssa (sc. NESMIUS).

There follows Matthias Schureri Lectori (ed. of Basel, 1512). Lector quod hoc Gregorii Nysseni opus leges, Ioanni Stablo viro docetissimo, gratias habeto.

Dedication. F. Io. Cono Norimontanus Beato Rhenano Selestensi S. P. [Inc.]: (p. A ii) Gregorii Nyssae episcopi librum, quem de homine nominant, olim a Burgundione Pisano, Friderici imperatoris praefecto, vel inducte et Graeco versum vel vetustate temporis aut librariorum inertia deprivatum, nativo splendore restituum, ut par est, hortaris et efflagitas, indignum arbitratus tam doctam tamque praecraram tanti virti philosophiam Attico lepore defluentem peregrina Gothicae barbarie offundi, ut neque legentibus sensa elucere possint, immo fastidium illa barbaro-latina (ut ita dicam), structura et vocum extorta affectataque fictio ingerat. . . . (Cono remarks that Rhenanus had studied Aristotle under Faber Stapelensis at Paris and had now turned his attention to the Christian Platonism of Gregory of Nyssa.) Quod itaque Burgundio versione sua, ne dicam inversione, verbo verbo reddens foedavit, Graeca quidem bona et lepì dissima sordidis Latinis immergens, tibi rursus emaculare et ad meliorem frugem referre studui non sine multa et assidua lubrificatione. Cum enim translationem illius inter legendum introspicio, Latina conferen Graecis, crede mihi isti tabulae fore librum persimilem, cius veluti egri somnia, vanae finguntur species, ut nec pes nec caput unii reddatur formae. Sed placidis coeant immittia. Verum nullo horum animo fractus per verborum portenta et sensorum vecpres, tametsi omnia scatere mendis, omnia inversa, cuncta fere Gothica et peregrina contemplatus, a capite ad calcem usque transcurri. . . . Atque in hunc modum totam hyemem (re fortasse utiliori neglecta, divi Chrysostomi inquam traductione) absumo. . . . Si sustines, verum dicam, facilius, purius et elegantius librum hunc tibi recentem a Graeco vertissem, si integrum exemplar succurrisset, quam quod haec Burgundionis interpretantia, non tam operosa quam enervata, tibi lecturo non nihil emenda, ne dicam culta pro tuo fortassis desiderio nunc offeram. Quis enim non novit difficilius inveterata et confacta revocare quam nova cudere? Effeci igitur tuo nomine, quod potui, Graeco exemplari deficientie undequeque conquirens, unde reliqua resarcirem. Hinc multa ex Basili Magni hexamero Graeco emendavi et Helia Cretensi ac Io. Damascus, qui verbam etiam multa capita divini Gregorii Nysseni tamquam eo longe posterior suis sententii interseruit, quem praecceptor tuus, Iacobus Faber, nuper Latinitate cultiori decoravit (1507), utinam tamen non inter aulicorum (ut ipse ait) tumultus et diversiorum angulos. Nihilominus maiorem Burgundione laudem facilior opera commeruit. Ceterum abisit a me haec dignitatis, ut Burgundionem, παραφραστην illum Latiae linguae ignarum, vel operosum illius studium et conatum ab omni prorsus laude proscribam, quin potius illi gratias non mediores habeamus, cuius occasione nostra clariora redere potuimus et quasi in sordibus repertum aurum suo nitori restituere. Absque enim Burgundione nec penitus haberemus hanc praecraram Gregorii Nysseni philosophiam. Demusque potius hoc harrisonum et Gothicum dicendi genus temporum vitio, quo omnes bonae artes et cultiores literae sepultae erant et quasi extinctae. . . . Ad Gregorium tuum redeo. Hunc tibi tamquam hyemis istius lubrificationes reddo. Hunc tibi etiam ex Graeco fonte emaculatum a portentosis saltem voculis et minime Latina dictione et phrasi sua sensa ex omni fere parte redolentem profero et assigno. . . . Porro quod ad stil nova illustrationem attinet, tu Aristarchus esto. Cum enim per te sapias ingenio facili praeditus et Latinam phrasim calleas, de tuo Gregori fac ut lubet. Et vel sic tales sinas, vel cultiorem reddes, quod tibi aut ceteris forsus lecturis noveris fore conducibilius. . . . (Cono goes on to discuss the content of Nyssenus’ philosophy and writings. The other opera mentioned are of course works of the “real” Gregory of Nyssa, not Nesmives. He refers to the De conditione hominis “quod Basileae in bibliotheca fratrum nostrorum habetur.” He also falsely ascribes a “vita divi Gregorii Nazianzeni” to Nyssenus. He repeats his earlier statement that John of Damascus and Elias of Crete incorporated much of Libri octo in
their writings. He concludes with the Western influence exerted by the treatise.) . . . Veniam inde ad nostros Latinos, sanctum illum doctorem imprimis Thomam Acquinatem, clarum ecclesiae catholicae lumen, omni laude, favore, lectione dignum, cui tanta Nysseni Gregorii visa est authoritas, ut in multis etiam difficillimis hunc in robur suarum probationum adducat, quod palam liquet ex summula illa, quae prima secundae nominatur. Albertus quoque Magnus tum libro secundo de mirabili scientia dei tum in libro de homine huius venerandi patris ex hoc opere plurima loca in probationis testimonium allegat. Merito igitur tam clari tamque probati philosophi Gregorii dico librum summum studio et favore prosequamur, quem sibi tot sancti et docti patres non dubitaverunt habere authority dignissimum. Tu enim beate et iucunde legas. Vale et deum pro me ora. Ex coenobio Fratrum ordinis Dominici ex Basilea cursim. VII luce Martii an. MDXII.


Chapter IV. (Cono's Lib. III, cap. I). [Inc.]: (p. 42) Omne corpus quatuor elementorum est concretio, et ex his confratur. Corpora vero animalium sanguinem habentium proxime ex quatuor humoribus genita sunt, sanguine, phlegmate, rubea cholera et nigra . . . . [Expl.]: Chapter XLIV. (Cono's Lib. VIII, cap. VIII): (p. 69) Etenim his quibus auferuntur, confert non possidere, sed avari qui rapuerunt inusti sunt. Ob avaritiam enim, non propter illorum utilitatem abstulerunt, Octavi et ultimo Libri Gregorii Nysseni de providentia finis.

Beatus Rhenanus Selestinensis Iacobo Fabro Stapulensi, praepositori suo. S.D. [Inc.]: (p. xliv) Literas tuas et elegantissimas et optatissimas Argentorati mihi reddidit Michael noster Humelbergius, bonis disciplinis mirum in modum ornatus, quas vix dici potest, quanto ardore ὑπὸ τὴς ἔνδονης gestiens etiam perlegerim. . . . (He goes on to mention Germany's preeminence in scholarship, giving a long list of names.) . . . Porro ab horum instituto minime alienus est Io. Stabius, excellens mathematicus, qui agents in aula Maximiliani Augusti variis subinde chorographiis illum oblectat. . . . Is inquam Stabius rarum et multis saecludis non visum opus Gregorii Nysseni quodam in loco repetit, quod Richardus Burgundio Pisanus aut Foederico Aenobarbo Caesar Augusto, omnium gentium terrori, qui Patavinam academiam primus instituit, tralatum dicavit, aut Foederico II (id enim incertum est, cum sub utrique flucerit) sed tam indocte, tam ineleganter, ut legi possit, intelligi nequeat. Quare cum id Matthia Schurerius, municeps meus, ex Vienna Panoniae, quae illustriissimorum Austriae archiducum regia est, imprimendum recepisset, non passus F. Io. Cono Norimbergensis, praepositorio meus, tam nobilere authorem ineptissimis et plus quam Gothicus dicendi abusionibus undique scatentem, tam foeda barbarie deturpatum in publicum prodiere, sed inter librarium Graecanici- corum codicium suppellexit, quae hic apud divum Dominicum ex testamento cardinalis Ragusini derelicta asservatur, quibusdam capitibus sparsim inventis, suo labore et studio effectit, ut depulsis tenebris, quibus incultori tratatio offundebat, nitiidor cognobiliorque in lucem exierit. Is itaque divinissimus pater omnium primum de homine philosophur deque creationis tum ordine tum ratione. . . . Nam quemadmodum in excellenti opere industriam suam exprimit artifex, ita et deus sapientiam suam maxime in hominis efficiendone non obscure declaravit, ut Nicolaus Cusanus, omnium pie philosophantium princeps, multis in locis com-monstrat. . . . (He goes on to mention some of the subjects considered by "Nyssenus."
Laudabiliorum tamen censeo, quae a christianis profuens eorum, quae ad hominis salutem attingent, simul adnomen, velut haec subtilissima divini Gregorii Nysseni doctrina, quae cum multorum errores coarquat, solidae veritati in nititur. E cuitus penu sanctissimus pater Io. Damascenus non paucu, sed sententias patrum colligeret, mutatus est, quem tu superiouribus annis (1507) diu ignotum et semilacerum ad studiosorium utilitatem reconcinnati. Ego vero huius operis utilitatem agud me perpendens, cum id ante praecoptor meus obeliscus un dique confodisset, eti aliis rebus et maxime literarum Graecarum studiis praepedier, excr ibendum duxi. Quod mihi tanto difficilium fuit, quanto vicinus tum mundinae Germanicae instabat, chalcographis promissum exemplar exponens. Plenum itaque labors negotium exitit adeo, ut opus mihi fuerit iuxta illud Luciani de Demosthene συνών ἡ νίκας ἐπὶ πόνοις ἱμέρων. Inter describendum autem Burgundioniaae tralationis stilum ubique fer exevi, ne tam rustica barbarie deterriti lectores, veluti de Nilo canes, ut vetus verbum usurpem, ibere rent et surgent. Burgundio enim verbo re densus Graecorum στροφα στα τον τον κα τον τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα τον κα το
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(photo.) 1512, mense Maio, Argentorati (Strasbourg): ex officina Matthiae Schurerii. Maiatta, II, 227; Hoffmann, II, 187; Panzer, VI, 55, 249; NUC. BN; (DFo; NNUT). See Composite Editions in the article on Gregorius Nyssenus, CTC, V, 37. Copies of some pages were kindly supplied by Virginia Woods Callahan.


(photo.) 1537, Coloniae (Cologne): ex offi-

(micro.) 1551, Coloniae (Cologne): ex officina M. Novesiani. Contains the same works as the 1537 edition. NUC. (MB; NcD).
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Doubtful Edition:

(*) 1512, Basileae (Basel): De philosophia Libri VIII, Jo. Conone int., Panzer, VI, 190, no. 110, quoting Quétif, II, 28. No trace of this edition has been found.

Passages illustrating the extent and character of Cono’s revision: In the Cono translation changes of words as against Burgundio have been italicized; changes of order have not been noted.

A. Where Cono had Burgundio’s Nyssenus (sc. Nemesis) and Faber Stapulensis’ Latin translation of John of Damascus, De fide orthodoxa:

Cono

Liber IV, cap. X (ed. 1551, p. 49)


Burgundio

Cap. XVII (ed. 1975, p. 96, 1.69ff.)

Volutatum hae quidem sunt animales aliae vero sunt corporales. Animales quidem sunt quae ani-
vero ignem. Sphaeriformes enim figurae atomorum concretas, et ignem et aerem, animam perficere ait. Heraclitus vero totam quidem animam evaporatione ex humidis.

C. Where Cono had available only Burgundio, De natura hominis:

Cono
Liber VI, cap. II (ed. 1551, p. 59)
Adversus vero sapientes Aegyptiorum verum esse fatum astruentes quod per astra est, verti autem orationibus et aversionibus. Esse enim quasdam astrorum curationes quae illa mitigent, et alias item superadditas virtutes, quae fatum avertere possint, propertia orationes curationesque deorum et aversiones excogitatet esse dicemus quoniam contingentium et non necessariorum faciunt esse fatum.

Burgundio
Cap. XXXV (ed. 1975, p. 135)
Adversus sapientes autem Aegyptiorum dicentes veram quidem esse eam quae per astra est fortunam, verti autem orationibus et aversionibus. Esse enim quasdam et horum ipsorum astrorum curationes quae mansuetcariunt illa, et alias quasdam superiacentes virtutes quae verteere eam possunt, et propertia orationes et curationes deorum et aversiones excogitatet esse dicemus quoniam contingentium et non necessariorum faciunt esse fortunam.

Biography:
See CTC, II, 113; V, 80, and the additional bibliography cited p. 61 above.

6. Anonymus B
An anonymous Latin translation of Nemesius, De natura hominis, appears in a Paris manuscript, BN lat. 2121. The text breaks off abruptly not long after the beginning of chapter XVI (M. ch. XVIII). Two dates appear in the manuscript. Above the title at the top of the first page is 1541 23 Maii. On fol. 27, at the end of the complete (see below) version of chapter III is 5 Decembris MD43.

There are no clues as to the identity of the translator except that the hand is sixteenth-century Italian. The translator worked from a Greek exemplar which attributed the treatise to Nemesius. The manuscript appears to be an autograph, not a copy, since there are many instances of a word being crossed out and another preferable one being written above it in the same hand. At times the writing is very careless (e.g., fol. 42). There are two quite different translations of the opening portion of chapter III (see below).

A comparison of the chapter divisions of Anonymus B with those of Matthaei follows:

Anonymus B           Matthaei
Chapters I–IX         I–IX
De auditu missing     X
Chapter X              XI
Chapters XI–XII        XII–XIII
Chapter XIII           XIV–XV
Chapters XIV–XVI       XVI–XVIII

a. Complete Translation
De natura hominis (Paris, BN lat. 2121). 1541. 23. maii [Inc.]: (fol. 1)
Nemesii episcopi Nemesiae (?) De anima et corpore caput p(rimu)m. Hominem optime atque adeo concinne esse ex anima intelligente et corpore comparatim itaque concinne ut cum multis probisque viris non aliter fieri ac constare possit visum est. Cum autem in dubitationem veniat de ipsius anime intellective appellatione utrum mens anime accedens ut alia ipsam intelligentem efficiat an anima sua sponte ac natura vim habeat intelligendi cum idque sit pars ipsius praecellissima ceu in corpore oculus. Nonnulli quidem inter quos habetur Plotinus animam dicunt ab animo omnino aliam esse ac diversam hominemque ex tribus constare volent rebus corpore anima atque mente quos Appollinaris episcopus Laodicensus est sequutus . . . . [Expl.] Chapter I. (fol. 9) haec dicta sint quandquidem homo ex anima et corpore constare ab omnibus habetur atque divisione facta primum de anima disseremus omissis questionibus ii que nimis subtile et aspere ac plerisque ob difficultatem non intellecte fuerunt.

Chapter II. [Inc.]: (fol. 9) De anima caput 2a. Que autem sit animi definitio inter omnes fere magna dissensus est. Democritus enim et Epi- curus atque universa Stoicorum secta animam corpus esse definetes de essentia ipsius quenam illa sit inter esse discrepant. Nam Stoici spiritum dicunt eam esse calidum atque igneum, Critias sanguinem . . . .

Chapter III [Inc.]: (fol. 24). De unione animae et corporis. Cap. 3. Quaerendum autem est quonam pacto animae et inanimati corporis connexio fiat. Est enim res perplexa . . . . calidum atque igneum, Critias sanguinem
.../. [Expl.] Chapter III (fol. 27) Animarum enim gradus conditionesque earumque ascensus et descensus quos Origines introduct quippe qui divinis minime inventamur scriptis neque cum Christianorum secta consentient pretermittendi sunt. 5 decembris MD43

Chapter IV. [Inc.]: (fol. 27) De corpore caput 4a. Omne corpus est ex quatuor concreta elementis, iis autem proxima sunt animantia que sanguinem habent ex quattuor constantia humoribus, sanguine scilicet flegmate ac bile cum flava tum nigra. ex iis enim sanguine predictis aliqua sunt que ex aliis constantia humoribus atque ex eo quod in ipsis proportionem cum sanguine habet .../. [Expl.]: Chapter XVI (p. 222, line 5) De voluptatibus. (fol. 43v) He enim ad universi generis conservatorem institutum, fieri autem potest et sine his in virginitate vivere. He autem neque necessario neque naturales sunt quae ebrietatis, luxuria, magna preter usum cibi expletio, neque enim ad generis propagationem conferunt ut legitimus congressus neque ad vitæ salutem sed plurimum nocent, qui igitur.

b. Partial Translation of Chapter III

The anonymous translator began a translation of chapter III on fol. 22v. At the bottom of fol. 23 (at M, p. 129, line 12) he broke off this attempt. At some point he resumed his work but apparently chose to discard the first effort and begin anew on chapter III. A single diagonal line is drawn through fols. 22v and 23, from right to left. This first translation of a portion of chapter III differs noticeably from the second, complete one. Fol. 23v is blank.

Chapter III. [Inc.]: (fol. 22v) De copulatione animae et corporis. Cap. 3. Quaerendum autem est quonam pacto animae et inanimati corporis copulatio fiat . . . est enim res . . . digna (The scribe has crossed out three words; then appears one in which the ink appears smudged; the final word of this incipit is "digna"). [Expl.]: (fol. 23) . . . the final two words are "natura habent." That the version ends at M, p. 129, line 12, can be determined from the previous line of the manuscript.

Manuscript:

(micro.) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 2121: s. XVI, misc. My transcription of passages from this manuscript was checked and corrected by Paul Oskar Kristeller. He ascertained that the letter at the end of the manuscript belonged to a much later period (Cat. BN II, 328).

7. Nicasius Ellebodius

Nicasius Ellebodius prepared the editio princeps of the Greek text of Nemesis of Emesa, De natura hominis. It was printed along with his Latin translation by Plantin in Antwerp in 1565. Unfortunately, Ellebodius did not follow the printing process closely enough, and as a result there were many typographical errors—some passages printed twice and others transposed. In 1566 a now unknown scholar in Esslingen had a copy of the edition and noted some errors in the margins. Later C. Seybold of Tubingen transmitted this information to Matthaei (1810), who printed it in his 1802 edition (pp. 403–5). This material was preceded by the copious notes of the 1671 editor (John Fell?).

In his dedication to Cardinal Granvelle, Ellebodius indicated that he had seen Valla’s edition and found it wanting. From the same source one learns that he used two manuscripts in preparing his text and from his Preface that with their aid he corrected numerous errors. His main Greek source was Bruxelles, Bibliothèque Royale, gr. 27 (11351–52); the other was probably Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, cod. graeac. 419 (s. XIV) (information kindly furnished by the late Benedict Einarson; see also Morani, La tradizione manoscritta, 63–64).

Ellebodius divided the treatise into forty-four chapters rather than the forty-two of Burgundio. Chapter IV (Burgundio’s De corpore) was divided into chapter IV, De corpore, and chapter V, De elementis. Chapter XLI (Burgundio’s De providentia) became chapter XLI, De providentia, and chapter XLI, Quarum rerum sit providentia. De metu became chapter XX and De ira, chapter XXI, not vice versa as in most previous texts. Ellebodius followed John of Damascus in this latter order (John’s chapters XXIX and XXX, pp. 121–22, ed. Buytaert).

Ellebodius wrote his dedication in Greek. His style of translation was labored, and as Verbeke and Moncho have pointed out, he was prone to circumlocutions.

Ellebodius’ version formed the basis of all later Latin editions beginning with that of Oxford, 1671, generally attributed to John Fell, bishop of Oxford. Though subsequent editors emended the Greek and Latin on the basis of further manuscript evidence and other translations, Matthaei’s text of 1802, which found its way into J. P. Migne’s Patrologia, is still largely that of Ellebodius.
Dedication (ed. of Halle, 1802). [Inc.]:
(p. 17).

NIKASIOΣ ΕΛΛΕΒΟΔΙΟΣ
ΚΑΣΑΕΤΑΝΟΣ
ΤΩ ΠΕΡΙΦΑΝΕΣΤΑΤΟ ΚΑΙ
ΑΙΔΕΣΙΜΩΤΑΤΩ
ΚΑΡΔΙΝΑΛΕΙ ΑΝΤΩΝΙΩ
ΠΕΡΕΝΟΙΤΩ
ΧΑΙΡΕΙΝ

[Inc.]: Tò περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου τοῦ Νεμε-
σίου βιβλίων προειλήμμα πι προσφω-
νήσαι, κράτιστε Αντώνιε Καρδινάλι, ὁυ
τοσούτω εἰς τὴν τοῦ γένους σου λαμπρό-
τητα καὶ τὴν δόξαν ἀποβλέψας . . . (Follow-
ing these laudatory remarks in the usual man-
ner, Ellebodius says he is sending the book to
Cardinal Granvelle to aid him in his studies.
Only Hippocrates among the ancients is worthy
of mention, and he dealt only with the body.
Nemesius dealt also with the soul. Ellebodius
go on to mention some of the content of the
treatise, including the popular “De voluntario et
involuntary,” “De fato,” and “De providentia.”
He remarks that Nemesius held generally ortho-
dox views. The date for Nemesius, suggests
Ellebodius, can be narrowed down because he
must have flourished later than Basil and his
circle but have lived before the time of Justinian,
when Origen’s views were condemned. He men-
tions that his manuscripts were not in good con-
tion, but by using two he was able to avoid
some errors. He mentions Valla’s version, which
he felt was defective.) [Expl.]: ἢ μεν οὖν
ἡμετέρα σπουδὴ τε καὶ προαίρεσις αὐτῆς
σου, λαμπρότατα Καρδινάλι, σύ δε ταύτης
ἡμᾶς ἀποδείχατο, δικαίως οὖν ἐν ἐκείναις
τῶν μεν κατωρθωμένων ἐπαυεῖν, τῶν δὲ παρ
ευμένων συνηγμού ἔχεων. Εἴρησο. ἐκ
Παταβίῳ. α ἐδ. μεταγενεωπόνος μηνὸς
τρίτη φιλονος.

Nicasius Ellebodius, Lectori S. [Inc.]: (p. 20)
Quae me ratio ad Nemesii editionem adhortata
sit, Lector optime, pluribus mihi verbis expon-
endum esse non arbitror. Nam si quis est qui
veteres scriptores et bibliothecarum latebris evoc-
cari et in aspectum lucemque proferri nolit, aut
non magnum judicio suo fructum eorum laudi
tribuendum existimet, quorum industriae cur-
riculum in hoc genere studiorum elaborat, huic
a judicio et omnino ab humanitate derelicto
studere probare se nemo debet . . . / . . .
[Expl.]: (p. 21) Hoc in genere cum viderem esse

Nemesium, qui Graece de praecipua ac neces-
saria philosophiae parte, et quae proprae ad nos
pertinat, hoc est, de natura hominis, apte, di-
lucide, et in quo plus est posita, quam in
ceteris omnibus, pie disserat; dedi operam, ut et
Graecum exemplan prodiret in publicum, quod
sexcentis locis, etsi in tam parvo opere credibile
vix est, mirabiliter mendis inquinatum duorum
vetutorum codicum ope expurgavitum, et
Latina quoque interpretatio, quo omnium intelli-
gentiae servirem, adiungeretur. Haec pauca de
consilio meo et opera, quam probari tibi cupio,
nescire te nolui. De ceteris, cum leges, pro
arbitrio tuo existimabis. Vale.

C. Plantinus Lectori S. [Inc.]: (p. 22) Non
inutilem studiois viris, neque irritam rem fac-
turum mihi videbar, si, quia Nemesium nunc pri-
num in lucem producimus, paucula de ipso
Nemesio adderem . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (p. 22)
Memit and Origenis et Apolinarii, quod ado-
lescens vidisse fortasse potuit. De loco nihil

De natura hominis. Chapter I (ed. of Antwerp,
1565). [Inc.]: (p. 1) Hominem ex animo intelli-
gente et corpore rectissime constructum esse,
atque ita quidem recte ut altier fieri ac cohaerere
non possit multi iique boni viri existimarunt
. . . / . . . [Expl.]: Chapter I. (p. 16) Quoniam
autem hominem ex animo constare et corpore
communis omnium sententia docet, age ut
distribue procedat oratio, prius de anima trac-
temus, sed ita ut subtiles et spinosas admodum et
vulgo ad intelligendum difficiles quaestiones
praetermittamus.

Chapter II. [Inc.]: (p. 17) De anima omnium
fere veterum rationes inter se dissentiant. De-
mocritus enim et Epicurus et omnis Stoicorum
philosophorum chorus, corpus esse animam di-
cunt . . . / . . . Chapter III. [Expl.]: (p. 45)
Nam gradus animarum, ascensus item et des-
census, quos Origenes inducit, nihil pertinentes
ad divinas litteras, neque cum Christianorum de-
cretis consentanei, relinquenti sunt. Chapter IV.
[Inc.]: (p. 45) Omne corpus et quatuor elementis
concretum et confutatum est. Proxime quidem
eorum quae sanguinem habent corpora, et qua-
tuor humoribus, sanguine, pituita, flava bile, et
atra . . . / . . . Chapter XLIV. [Expl.]: (p. 142)
Cenim, et is, quibus eripitur, verisimile est
conducere, non possidere; et qui alienam pecu-
niam concupierunt, iniusti. Nam habendi cupidit-
tate inducti, non quia illis fit utile, ademerunt.
Bibliography:
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(partial typescript) 1565, Antverpiae (Antwerp): ex officina C. Plantini. (Gr.-Lat.) Graesse, IV, 657; Hoffmann, II, 615; NUC. Adams N-157; 158; NUC. BL; BN; Cambridge, Emmanuel College and Trinity College (= Adams N-157); Cambridge, Kings College and Trinity College (Adams N-158). The BL copy contains manuscript notes by Isaac Casaubon. The copy at Yale was inspected for me by F. E. Cranz.

(*) 1576, Parisiiis (Paris): apud M. Somnium, in Sacra bibliotheca sanctorum patrum . . . , ed. M. de la Bigne. NUC. (MH; NcD). Reference verified by Jesse M. Savage of NcD.


(*) 1644, Paris: in Magna Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum. NUC. BN; (NCC; MBTS).
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(*) 1780, Augsburg: in P. D. Schram, Analysis Operum SS Patrum. An epitome only. NUC. (PLat).

(*) 1765, Paris: in A. Galland, Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum (Gr.-Lat.), VII, 355ff.; Hoffmann, II, 615; NUC. (NN; NJPF; ICN).

1802, Halae Magdeburgicae (Halle): (Gr.-Lat.) Graesse, IV, 657; Hoffmann, II, 615; NUC. BL; BN; (CTY; CU; MH). This edition was mechanically reproduced in Hildesheim in 1967.


Biography:
Nicasius Elleboodiou Caselatus (Nicaise van Ellebaut or Helbaut or Ellebode), a doctor, philosopher, and poet, was born at Cassel in Flanders in the second quarter of the sixteenth century, probably around 1535. In 1555 he began studies at the Collegium Germanicum in Rome. He soon became proficient in the Greek language. From 1558 to 1561 he taught Greek and Latin at the seminary in Tyrnan to which he had been called by Nikolaus Oláh, archbishop of Gran (Hungary). When the Jesuits opened a new college in Tyrnan, he returned to Italy, to Padua, to continue his studies. Elleboodiou was a close friend of Michael Sophianos from Chios, who taught in Padua and with whom he worked on Greek texts. His reputation as a scholar won for him friends in many different fields, among them Paulus Manutius, Giovanni Vincenzo Pinelli, Antoine Perrenot Cardinal Granvelle, Melchior Guilandinus the botanist, and Stephan Radeczi (Radicus) of Hungary. In 1565 he published his Nemesius, dedicating it to Cardinal Granvelle. In early 1568 he moved to Pinelli's house, a gathering place for scholars, and began further study
of medicine under the guidance of Girolamo Mercuriale. Ellebodius received doctorates in both philosophy and medicine, but he still found time to make a Latin version of the pseudo-Aristotelian Problematia I–XI. In 1571 his friend Stephan Radeczki, who had become bishop of Grosswardein and president of the Hungarian parliament, invited him to come to Pressburg. Ellebodius renewed his acquaintance with former fellow medical students from Padua, including Georg Pürkrich with whom he practiced in Pressburg, although he lived in the home of Radeczki. When the latter became bishop of Eger in 1572, he appointed Ellebodius a canon. When the bishop became viceroy of Hungary in 1573, Ellebodius accompanied him on his travels throughout the realm. In 1575 he revisited Cassel, seeing his aged parents, before returning to Hungary by way of Antwerp, Prague, and Vienna, in each of which towns he met with scholars. Two years after his return he fell victim to the plague and died on June 4, 1577. After the death of his brother, his library went to his benefactor, Radeczki.

Works: Letters on various scientific subjects which have been published in Daniel Heinius, Epistolae illustrium Belgarum; also an Epistola ad Carolum Clusium, the botanist; several poems in Deliciae Poetarum Belgarum of Gruter. D. Wagner, G. Verbeke, and J. Moncho have called attention to some little or unknown Latin translations and commentaries of Ellebodius. They appear in manuscripts in the Ambrosian Library. The items are listed in A. Rivolta and D. Bassi, Catalogo dei codici Pinelliani dell’ Ambrosiana (1933); cf. Kristeller, Iter I (1963), index under Ellebodius (p. 473). They include a translation with notes of Aristotle, Magna Moralia; notes or commentaries on a number of other works of Aristotle including the Physics, Nicomachean Ethics, Parva Naturalia, Problematia, and Poetics (of which Ellebodius made a paraphrase). The notes and emendations on the Poetics have been included in the latest critical edition (R. Kassel, Oxford, 1965), whose editor called attention to them earlier (“Unbeachtete Renaissance-Emendationen zur aristotelischen Poetik,” Rheinisches Museum, CV [1962], 111–22). See D. Wagner (see Bibliography, below), 5–6; G. Verbeke and J. Moncho, Némesius, xcvi, and n. 5, and for Pinelli, see P. Guidi, Vita Vincentii Pinelli (1607), 346ff. Also unpublished are translations of the Greek grammar of Apollonius Dyskolos and of a work on Poibius.


8. Federicus Morellus

Federicus Morellus made a Latin translation of chapters II and III of Nemesis of Emesa. De natura hominis, at some time before its publication in the 1615 bilingual edition of works of Gregory of Nyssa. The title, De anima, and the ascription of the treatise to Nyssen were probably taken by Morellus from the Greek manuscript which he used. It remains unidentified. C. Morellus, brother of Federicus and nominal editor of the 1615 edition, said that the manuscript came into his hands by way of his friend Jacques Auguste de Thou, librarian of the Bibliothèque Royale (see “Lectori Aequanimo,” reprinted in PG, XLIV, 53). W. Telfer, Cyril of Jerusalem and Nemesis of Emesa, 220, states that the manuscript came from the library of Federico Borromeo. For a discussion of the
manuscript tradition underlying Morellus’ version, see M. Morani, La tradizione manoscritta, 58–59. On the question of manuscripts containing only chapters II and III, De anima, see above, p. 34. Morellus’ translation subsequently appeared in the 1617 Latin and 1638 Greek-Latin editions of the works of Nyssenus. From the latter it made its way into J. P. Migne’s Patrologia among the works of Nyssenus, although it had for many years been recognized as an excerpt from Nemesius, De natura hominis.


Editions:

(photo.) 1615, Paris: apud M. Sommion (Gr.-Lat.) NUC. BN; (MH).

1615, Paris: apud S. Cramoisy (Gr.-Lat.) BN; (CU).


(photo.) 1617, Coloniae (Cologne): sumpt. Ant. Hierati. Examined by the late B. Peebles at DCU. NUC. (DCU).

1638, Paris: sumpt. Aeg. Morelli (Gr.-Lat.) Graesse, II, 148; Hoffmann, II, 184; NUC. BL; BN; (CtY; CU; MH).

1858, Paris: Petit-Montrouge. (PG, XLV, 187–222. NUC. BL; BN; (CtY; CU; MH).

1863, Paris: PG, XL, 187–222. Another edition of the above. NUC. (MB; NcU). The copy at the University of San Francisco was used.
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9. Doubtful Translations

(a) Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale, J V 27. This manuscript was lost in a fire in 1904. It contained, according to Appendice al Passini, the only catalogue mentioning it, a Latin translation on fols. 26ff. of Gregorius Nyssenus, Opuscula de natura humana et de providentia. Direttore D. Dondi of the Biblioteca Nazionale di Torino kindly informed me that there is no indication that the attribution to Nyssenus was questioned. The inclusion of “et de providentia” (the final portion of Nemesius, De natura hominis), however, raises the possibility that it might have been a version of Nemesius’ work. The manuscript is listed in Kristeller, Iter, II, 179.

(b) H. Diels in his Handschriften der antiken Aerzte, p. 68 (Abhldg. I of the Königl. preuss. Akademie zu Berlin [1906]) under “Nemesius-Übersetzungen,” lists three manuscripts which are in fact only Greek texts, two of which are well known: Dresden: Da 57, Da 58. Nevertheless, a further check was made. Professor Dr. Burgemeister and Dipl. Phil. Stein of the Sächsische Landesbibliothek, Dresden, confirmed that the two manuscripts contain only Greek texts. Regarding the third manuscript mentioned by Diels, Hamburg, Bibl. urb. Loescher 12788, an inquiry was made of the Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Hamburg. Eva Horvath of the Hamburg library staff referred me to the Dresden library, where Dr. Burgemeister informed me that Loescher 12788 is identical with Da 57, the above-mentioned Greek manuscript.

SPURIOUS WORK

II. DE CONTEMNENDA MORTE


The treatise De contemnenda morte has been connected with the name of Nemesius of Emesa in modern times since Hieronymus Wolf in 1577 pointed out that in a manuscript from the library of John Jacob Fugger, now Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, cod. græc. 100 (s. XV), there is a work that contains the greater part of De contemnenda morte (up to chapter 20, τοσις το ημιν ειρησθω = PG, CLIV, 1203–1204C) and
which bears the title Νεμεσίου λόγος ως ἀλογος ἐστὶν ὁ δεινάτου φόβος. Wolf's information appears in his short essay “De Cydonio,” which follows the Greek-Latin text in some editions (see below). In contrast to Monac. gr. 100, the rest of the manuscripts, including the one used by Seiler, Monac. gr. 58 (s. XV–XVI), name Demetrius Cydones as the author. Most scholars have accepted this attribution. The case of Monac. gr. 100 is suspect because De contemnenda morte is the final treatise in the collection and is immediately preceded by two chapters (De voluptate and De aegritudine, M. XVIII and XIX) from the genuine work of Nemesius, De natura hominis. The words τοῦ αὐτοῦ preceding De contemnenda may originally have been written by a careless scribe; then later Νεμεσίου λόγος and the title could have been added.

J. Draeseke alone has made a case for Nemesian authorship. He believed that the Platonism of the writer was not that of the High Middle Ages but of an earlier era. He pointed out that the treatise most often occurs in collections of works of Plato, Aristotle, and other earlier philosophers, not of later medieval writers. He suggested that the theological and social ideas expressed were not those of a fourteenth-century Byzantine writer. Finally, he advanced the hypothesis that Demetrius Cydones found De contemnenda morte in a manuscript either under the name of Nemesius or without ascription of authorship. Following the custom of many in his day, he then made the treatise his own and put it out under his own name. Most scholars remain unconvinced by Draeseke’s arguments and believe that the author was the above-mentioned Cydones, friend and adviser of the Emperor John VI Kantakuzenos (1341–55). When the latter left the throne for the solitude of the monastery, Demetrius accompanied him but did not himself become a monk. He remained active in the theological controversies of his times into the last decade of the century, as his correspondence with Manuel II Palaeologos testifies. He knew Nicolas Cabasilas and numbered among his acquaintances such diverse personalities as Barlaam (whose views he supported) and Gregory Palamas. An enthusiastic Thomist, he eventually left the Eastern church for the Latin branch of Christendom. Demetrius authored many works. He is especially remembered for translating into Greek such Latin writers as Augustine, Anselm, and Thomas Aquinas.

Bibliography:


Cydones’ correspondence has been discussed and edited on several occasions by R. J. Loenertz: Les recueils des lettres de Démétrius Cydonés, Studi e Testi 131 (1947); Démétrois Cydonès, Correspondance, Studi e Testi 186 (1956) and 208 (1960).

TRANSLATION

1. Raphael Seilerus

Raphael Seiler made a Latin translation of the treatise De contemnenda morte and edited it along with the Greek text in 1553. Seiler used a manuscript from the library of John Jacob Fugger, now Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, cod. graec. gr. 58 (s. XV/XVI). Seiler’s notes appear in the margins. This copy attributed the work to Demetrius Cydones, who was generally, and continues to be, considered the author. Seiler’s text and translation were reprinted in 1559 in a collection of works by various Greek theologians edited by Conrad Gesner. It was entitled Veterum aliquid theologorum Graecorum orthodoxorum libri graeci latinitate donati. Gesner added nothing except the index.

In 1577 Hieronymus Wolf, who had been curator of the Fugger library from 1551 to 1557, again edited Seiler’s work; he added a short essay, “De Cydonio,” and seven pages of notes “Anonymi.” Wolf himself may have written these notes (see below, p. 71). His volume was entitled Doctrina recte vivendi ac moriendi. Like Gesner’s edition, it was a collection assembled from a wide variety of authors. This edition, in turn, was reprinted under the editorship of Valentin Thilo of Liegnitz in 1586. In 1786 the text was revised, further annotated, and published by
Christoph Kuinoel. Kuinoel’s revision of the Greek text, along with Seiler’s Latin, was incorporated by J. P. Migne in his *Patrologia Graeca*. *De contemnenda morte* (ed. of Paris, 1857). [Inc.]: (PG, CLIV, 1170). Caput I. Animi a corpore discissum quem mortem nominare solemus, omnes oderunt, omnes omnium malorum perniciosissimum ducent . . . . . [Expl.]: (p. 1211) deinceps non modo mortem non timebit, sed eius etiam cunctationem moleste feret eamque a Deo exoptabit ut eo pacto suaviorem vita fruatur.

**Editions:**

(*) 1553, Basileae (Basel): ap. Ioan. Oporinum. (Gr.-Lat.) *De contemnenda morte*, oratio, *Hermiae philosophi Irriso gentilium philosophorum. Ex inclyti ac generosi D. D. Ioannis Iacobi Fuggeri splendidiss. ac ornatis. bibliotheca desumpta et nunc primum cum graece tum latine Raphaelis Seileri Augustani, Geryonis filii, opera ac versione in lucem prolatae.* Adams D-249; NUC. BL; BN; Cambridge, Emmanuel College; (IU).


(*) 1560, Tiguri (Zurich): per A. Gesnerum. As above except that all but one work (not Cydones*) are dated 1560. Adams T-557. BL; BN (s.v. C. Gesner); Cambridge, Emmanuel College.

(photo.) 1577, Basileae (Basel): Petri Pernae impensa. in *Doctrina recte vivendi ac moriendi ad mores pie ac honeste confirmandos etiam adultis ad linguas utriusque exercitiae iuvenibus potissimum conducens* (Gr.-Lat.), ed. H. Wolf. Adams D-712. BN; Cambridge University Library.

A copy of H. Wolf’s essay, “De Cydonio,” and of the Annotationes Anonymi was kindly provided by D. J. McKitterick of the Cambridge University Library.


(*) 1786, Lipsiae (Leipzig): *Demetrior Cydonii opusculum de contemnenda morte, graece et latine rec., emend., explicat.* Christoph Theoph. Kuinoel. NUC. BL; BN; (DLC; MH; PU).


1901, Leipzig: *De contemnenda morte* (Bibliotheca Teubneriana), ed. H. Deckelmann. NUC. BL; BN; (CU; IU; NjP).

**Biography:**

Raphael Seiler (Seyler) was born in 1535 in Augsburg. His father was Gereon (Geryon) Seiler, a physician who was also active in political affairs. Some details of Raphael’s early life appear in the correspondence of his father with Philip of Hesse. At about fifteen years of age he had already written Latin and Greek poems to a number of individuals, including members of the Fugger family. They were printed in 1551. His father wrote that at age twenty-one he had an excellent command of Greek and Latin and spoke and wrote French well. He wanted his son to spend a year in Italy to learn the language. He suggested to Philip of Hesse that he might use the young man as his emissary. Raphael studied in France and then proceeded to Italy, where in 1558 he received a doctorate in law from the University of Padua. He continued to read in law for some time and also to perfect his knowledge of ancient and modern languages. He traveled extensively as Philip’s legate in judicial matters, on one occasion spending seven months in Rome. He is on record as having paid the fee for registration as a doctor of laws in Bologna. In June 1558 he was named assistant judge of the court of appeal on the French circuit and removed to Speyer. There he pursued his profession for some years, but for an unknown reason gave up that responsibility and went to Worms, where he was a civil lawyer. He died at Worms late in 1573 or early in 1574.

He was acquainted with members of the Fugger family as well as with Hieronymus Wolf and Conrad Gesner, among others. He is largely remembered for his work on the history of the German courts. He published in 1572–73 a collection of decisions from the beginning of the court system until 1573, which was later expanded by C. Barth.

**Works:** In addition to the Latin version of *De contemnenda morte* and the above-mentioned poems: *Cammergerichts. Bei und End Urtheil.*
pts. I and II (1572); Remissiones seu relegationes legum (1571); Annotata de personis judicii cameralis ab illius exordio usque ad annum 1572; Der Römischen Kaiserlichen Mayestät und... Cammergerichts Ordnung (1573).

Bibliography: C. Gesner and J. Simler, Bibliotheca Universalis (Zurich, 1583), 283 and App., 93; W. Roth, “Raphael Seyler,” Zeitschr. der Savigny-Stiftung, Germ., XXI (1900), 218–22, with further bibliography of Seiler’s legal works; Schottenloher, II, nos. 19836–38 (lists two poems composed on the occasion of Seiler’s marriage to Anna Maria Diefstetter in 1559); Zedler, XXXVI, 1536–37.

COMMENTARY

a. Anonymus (Hieronymus Wolfius?)

Following the Greek-Latin text of De contemnenda morte in some editions are several poems, a short essay, “De Cydonio,” by the editor, Hieronymus Wolf, and seven pages of Annotationes, ostensibly by an anonymous writer who might well have been Wolf himself, Conrad Gesner, or another. Wolf and Gesner (both b. 1516) had edited Seiler’s translation and edition of the Cydones work and were scholars of note; both moved in the same circles as he did. The notes are obviously the work of a competent scholar. The note on “τοσαότα ήμιν εϊρήνησθω,” (see below, p. 71b) closely resembles what Wolf says in his essay, though of course he could merely have copied the statement. The poem with which the writer ends his Annotationes was clearly written by a close friend and mentor of Seiler who had been present at his baptism. The identity might be disclosed by church records in Augsburg if they have survived. Fabricius seems to have suspected that Wolf was the annotator when he said that Wolf added the notes, although, again, he may merely have meant that Wolf included them.

In the essay, Wolf first gives some facts, taken from Raphael Volaterranus’s biography of Cydones. Then he mentions the manuscript in the Fugger library (Monac. gr. 100), which contained a large portion of De contemnenda morte, attributing it to Nemesis. He expressed the opinion that the identity of the author was not of great concern; the treatise had merits of its own.

The majority of the notes that immediately follow the essay are purely textual; for example, the first note deals with the anonymous’ preference for a genitive rather than an accusative construction. A few of them comment on the text or translation; for example, the next to the last note on the first page (p. 553) on “ὅτι εὐθὺς” presented the annotator with the opportunity to explain Seiler’s opinions on judgment. The most important note in this category appears on page 558 on “τοσαότα ήμιν εϊρήνησθω” and should be compared with what Wolf says in his “De Cydonio.”

The notes are followed immediately, on the next line, by a fourteen-line Greek poem addressed “To the translator.” As mentioned above, it contains clues to the identity of the anonymous writer. Seiler, who of course knew who he was, is addressed as “son, beloved by God,” and “Oh, dear child.” The poem, aside from the opening line, is devoted to chiding Seiler for a character weakness: the baptismal vow that he be both beloved by God and pleasing to God had not been entirely kept. The writer spared no words: “A belligerent spirit, fighting over your cups, has seized hold of your life. The reward of drunkenness is not a noble one.” “Take heed of my wise counsel, so that you may always be dear to me and death may not seem terrible.”

De Cydonio (ed. of Basel, 1577). [Inc.]: (p. 551) De hoc certi nihil statuere possumus, nisi forte sit, de quo Volaterranus ita scribit: ... extat in bibliotheca Fuggerana libellus eiusdem argumenti, qui inscribitur, Νεμεσίου λόγος ὡς ἀλογός ἐστι θεαντός φόβος e quo magna pars huius opusculi videtur esse transcripta, usque ad illud: τοσαότα ήμιν εϊρήνησθω. Ea quae sequuntur, ικανά (διδόκοι μοι [τοὺς μὴ παντάπασι βραδεις καταπείσαι] etc., usque ad finem, in Nemesis illo desunt. Sed parum referre puto cuius sit autors ... /...

[Expl.]: (p. 552) Num qui in sacris literis versat philosophantur multis parasangis in judicio reum vincunt eos qui nudis ingeniis sui coniecturis et hominum opinionibus nituntur.

Anonymi in Cydonium Annotationes (ed. of Basel, 1577).

[Inc.]: (p. 553) περί καταφρονείν τῶν θανάτων Malim... τῶν θανάτων (p. 558) τοσαότα ήμιν εϊρήνησθω. Haece Nemessi nomine anno 1552 in Fuggerano quodam codice me legere memini et hic libellum eum finiri. Sed altero interpres usus est, et haec et quae sequuntur usque ad finem Cydonio tribuebat. Eiusdem quidem autors esse omnis, sive illius (quod verisimilium est) styli similitudo indicat ... / ...
[Expl.]: (p. 560) Nolim ego meum quantulum-cunque de Graecis literis iudicum, longo usu et indefesso studio partum, cum mille cariosis codicibus commutatum. There follows a Greek maxim and the fourteen line poem, "To the translator," which concludes: μὴ γὰρ αὐνὸντι βίου τέλος σὺν θεῷ.

Editions:
1577. See above, p. 70.
1586. See above, p. 70.